



3 1761 03550 9637

HISTORY OF THE POPES

VOL. XIII

PASTOR'S HISTORY OF THE POPES

THE HISTORY OF THE POPES. Translated from

the German of LUDWIG, FREIHERR VON PASTOR. Edited, as to Vols. I.-VI., by the late FREDERICK IGNATIUS ANTROBUS, and, as to Vols. VII.-XIV., by RALPH FRANCIS KERR, of the London Oratory. In 14 Volumes.

Vols. I. and II.	A.D. 1305-1458.
Vols. III. and IV.	A.D. 1458-1483.
Vols. V. and VI.	A.D. 1484-1513.
Vols. VII. and VIII.	A.D. 1513-1521.
Vols. IX. and X.	A.D. 1522-1534.
Vols. XI. and XII.	A.D. 1534-1549.
Vols. XIII. and XIV.	A.D. 1550-1559.

W.P.

THE HISTORY OF THE POPES,

FROM THE CLOSE OF THE MIDDLE AGES

DRAWN FROM THE SECRET ARCHIVES OF THE VATICAN AND OTHER
ORIGINAL SOURCES

FROM THE GERMAN OF

LUDWIG, FREIHERR VON PASTOR

EDITED BY

RALPH FRANCIS KERR

OF THE LONDON ORATORY

VOLUME XIII

JULIUS III. (1550-1555)

*195779
4.5.25*

LONDON

KEGAN PAUL, TRENCH, TRUBNER & CO., LTD.

BROADWAY HOUSE: 68-74 CARTER LANE, E.C.

1924



Bx
955
P35
1898
v.13

CONTENTS OF VOLUME XIII

	PAGE
Collections of Archives and Manuscripts referred to in Volumes XIII. and XIV.	vii
Complete Titles of Books frequently quoted in Volumes XIII. and XIV.	ix
Table of Contents	xxvii
List of Unpublished Documents in Appendix	xl

JULIUS III., 1550-1555.

The election of Julius III.	I-44
Previous life, character and beginning of the reign of Julius III.	45-76
Preparations for the reassembling of the Council in Trent. The dispute concerning the Duchy of Parma	76-98
Second Period of the Council of Trent	99-128
War in Upper and Central Italy. Julius III.'s efforts for peace. Conclusion of his pontificate and his death	129-157
Efforts of Julius III. for reform. Creation of Cardinals	158-179
Spread of the Society of Jesus. Their reforming activi- ties in Spain, Portugal, Italy and Germany	180-209
Activity of the Roman Inquisition in Italy. Spread of heresy in Germany, Poland and France	210-236
Accession of Queen Mary of England. Her marriage to Philip of Spain	237-269
Legation of Cardinal Pole. The reconciliation of England with the Holy See	270-289
Spread of Christianity in the New World	290-306

The East Indies and the Mission of St. Francis Xavier	307-325
Julius III. in relation to Letters and Art. Michael Angelo and the rebuilding of St. Peter's. The Villa Giulia	326-355
Rome at the end of the Renaissance period	356-427
Appendix of Unpublished Documents	431-459
Index of Names	460-475

COLLECTIONS OF ARCHIVES AND MANUSCRIPTS REFERRED TO IN VOLUMES XIII. AND XIV.

ANCONA—Communal Archives.
AREZZO—Library.

BERLIN—Royal Library.
BOLOGNA—State Archives.
——— University Library.
BRESCIA—Quirini Library.
BRUSSELS—State Archives.

CITTÀ DI CASTELLO—Graziani
Archives.

FERRARA—Communal Library.
FLORENCE—National Library.
——— State Archives.
FOGGIA—Communal Library.
FOLIGNO—Seminary Library.
FRANKFURT A. M.—Library.

GENOA—State Archives.
——— University Library.
GÖRLITZ—Milichsche Library.
GOTHA—Library.
GUBBIO—Communal Archives.
——— Episcopal Archives.

HALL I. TIROL—Provincial Ar-
chives of the Tyrolese
Franciscans.
HOHENEMS—Family Archives.

INNSBRUCK—Vice-regal Ar-
chives.

LONDON—British Museum.
LUCCA—State Archives.
LUND—Library.

LYONS—Library.
MACERATA—Library.
MADRID—Library of the Duke
of Ossuna.
MANTUA—Gonzaga Archives.
MAYENCE—Seminary Library.
MILAN—Ambrosian Library.
——— Gallarati Scotti Ar-
chives.

——— Brera Library.
——— Trivulziana Library.
——— State Archives.

MODENA—State Archives.
MONTE SAN SAVINO—Commu-
nal Archives.
MUNICH—Court and State
Library.

NAPLES—Library of the *Soc.
di storia patria*.
——— National Library.
——— National Library in the
Certosa di S. Martino.
——— State Archives.
NICASTRO—Episcopal Archives.

PARIS—National Archives.
——— National Library.
PARMA—Palatine Library
——— State Archives.
PERUGIA—Library.
PIACENZA—Communal Library.
PISA—University Library.
PISTOIA—Fabroniana Library.

RAVENNA—Classe Library.
REGGIO—Episcopal Archives.

ROME—

(a) *Archives :*

the Anima.
the Boncompagni.
the Capitol.
the Colonna.
the Doria—Pamphili.
the Gaetani.
the Ricci.
the Santa Croce.
the Spanish Embassy.
the Secretary of
Briefs ¹
General, of the Augustinians.
General, of the Theatines.
Consistorial, of the Vatican.
the Papal Secret (Secret Archives of the Vatican).
of the State.

(b) *Libraries :*

Accademia di S Cecilia
Alessandrina.
Altieri.
Angelica.
Barberini ²
Casanatense.
Chigi.
Corsini.
S. Croce in Gerusalemme.

ROME—*Libraries continued.*

S. Pietro in Vincoli.
Vatican.
Vittorio Emanuele.

SCHAFFHAUSEN—State Library.

SEVILLE—Archives of the Indies.

SIENA—State Archives.

——— Library.

SIMANCAS—Archives.

STOCKHOLM—Library.

TRENT—Library.

TREVES—Seminary Library.

UPSALA—Library.

VENICE—Library of St. Mark.

——— Correr Museum.

——— State Archives.

VICENZA—Bertoliana Library.

VITERBO—State Archives.

VOLTERRA—Inghirami Archives.

——— Maffei Archives.

VIENNA—Rossiana Library.

——— Court and State Archives.

——— Court Library.

WOLFENBÜTTEL—Library .

ZEITZ—Convent Library.

¹ Under Pius X. included in the Papal Secret Archives,

² Now in the Vatican Library.

COMPLETE TITLES OF BOOKS QUOTED IN VOLUMES XIII AND XIV

- Acts of the Privy Council of England. New Series, ed. by *John Roche Dasent*, vols. I–II, London, 1890–1895.
- Adinolfi*, P. Il Canale di Ponte e le sue circostanti parti. Narni, 1860.
- La via sacra o del Papa. Roma, 1865.
- Roma nell'età di mezzo. 2 vols., Roma, 1881.
- Adriani*, G. B. Istoria de' suoi tempi. Vol. I. *et seqq.*, Prato, 1822.
- Albèri*, E. Le relazioni degli ambasciatori Veneti al Senato durante il secolo decimosesto. 3 series, Firenze, 1839–1855.
- Amabile*, L. Il S. Officio della Inquisizione in Napoli. Vol. I., Città di Castello, 1892.
- Ambros*, A. W.. Geschichte der Musik. Vol. IV., 2nd ed., Leipzig, 1881.
- Analecta Bollandiana*. 30 vols., Paris-Bruxelles, 1882–1911.
- Ancel*, R. La question de Sienne et la politique du cardinal Carlo Carafa, 1556 à 1557. Bruges, 1905.
- La secrétairerie pontificale sous Paul IV. Paris, 1906.
- Paul IV. et le Concile. Louvain, 1907.
- Le Vatican sous Paul IV. Contribution à l'histoire du Palais Pontifical. Rev. Bénédictine, Jan., 1908, pp. 48–71.
- L'activité réformatrice de Paul IV. Paris, 1909.
- La disgrâce et le procès des Carafa d'après des documents inédits 1559 à 1567. Maredsous, 1909.
- La réconciliation de l'Angleterre avec le Saint-Siège sous Marie Tudor. Légation du Cardinal Pole en Angleterre 1553–1554. Revue d'hist. ecclés., X., Louvain, 1909, 521–536. 744–798.
- Nonciatures de France. Nonciatures de Paul IV. (avec la dernière année de Jules III. et Marcel II.). Publ. par R.A., Vol. I. Nonciatures de Sebastiano Gualterio et de Cesare Brancatio (Mai 1554—Juillet 1557) 1^{re} et 2^e Partie., Paris, 1909, 1911.
- Andrea*, Alex. De la guerra de Campaña de Roma y del segno de Napoles en el pontificado de Paulo IV. Tres libros, Madrid, 1589.
- Archivio storico dell' Arte*, publ. p. Gnoli. Vol. I. *et seqq.*, Roma, 1888 *seq.*
- Archivio storico Italiano*. 5 Series, Firenze, 1842 *seq.*
- Archivio storico Lombardo*. Vols. I. *seqq.*, Milano, 1874 *seqq.*

- Archivio storico per le provincie Napolitane.* Vols. I. *seqq.*, Napoli, 1876 *seqq.*
- Aretino, P.* Lettere. 6 vols. Paris, 1609.
- Armellini, M.* Le chiese di Roma dalle loro origini sino al secolo XVI. Roma, 1887.
- Arte L'.* Continuation of the *Archivio storico dell' Arte.* Roma, 1898 *seq.*
- Astrain, A., S. J.* Historia de la Compañia de Jesus en la Asistencia de España. 2 vols. Madrid, 1902-1905.
- Atti e Memorie della r. deputaz. di storia patria per la prov. dell' Emilia.* Prima Serie 1-8; Nuova Serie 1 *seqq.* Modena, 1863 *seqq.*
- Balan, P.* Gli assedii della Mirandola di papa Giulio II. nel 1511 e di papa Giulio III. nel 1551 e 1552 narrati secondo i più recenti documenti. 2nd ed. Mirandola, 1876.
- *Storia d'Italia.* 6 vols. Modena, 1882.
- Baracconi, G.* I Rioni di Roma. Terza ristampa. Torino-Roma, 1905
- Barbier de Montault, X.* Oeuvres complètes, Poitiers-Paris, 1899 *seqq.*
- Barelli, F. M.* Memorie dell' originie ed uomini illustri della Congreg. de' Chierici Regolari di S Paolo. 2 vols. Bologna, 1703.
- Bartoli, A.* Cento vedute di Roma antica. Firenze, 1911.
- Batiffol, P.* La Vaticane de Paul III. à Paul V. Paris, 1890.
- Battistella, A.* Il S. Offizio e la Riforma religiosa in Bologna. Bologna, 1905.
- Baumgarten, H.* Johannes Sleidanus' Briefwechsel. Strassburg, 1881.
- Beccadelli, L.* Monumenti di varia letteratura tratti dai manoscritti di Mgr. L. B., ed. *Morandi.* Bologna, 1797-1804.
- Beccari, C., S. J.* Rerum Aethiopicarum Scriptores occidentales inediti a saeculo XVI. ad XIX. Vols. V. and X. Roma, 1907, 1910.
- Beluzzi, G. B.* (detto il Sammarino), Diario autobiogr., ed. *P. Egidi,* Napoli, 1907.
- Benigni, U.* Die Getreidpolitik der Päpste. Ed. *G. Ruhland,* Berlin, 1898.
- Benrath, K.* Die Reformation in Venedig. Halle, 1887.
- Berliner, A.* Geschichte der Juden in Rom von dem ältesten zeiten bis zur Gegenwart. 2 vols. Frankfurt a.M., 1893.
- Bernabei, Vita del Card. Morone.* Modena, 1885.
- Bernino, D.* Historia di tutte l'heresie. Vol. IV., Venezia, 1724.
- Berthier, J. J.* L'église de la Minerve à Rome. Rome, 1910.
- Bertolotti, A.* Artisti Lombardi a Roma nei secoli XV., XVI., e XVII. Studi e ricerche negli archivi Römami. 2 vols., Milano, 1881.
- Artisti Modenesi, Parmesi e della Lunigiana a Roma nei secoli XV., XVI., e XVII. Modena, 1882.
- Artisti Bolognesi, Ferrarese ed alcuni altri a Roma. Bologna, 1885.

- Bertolotti, A.* Artisti subalpini a Roma. Mantova, 1885.
 ——— Artisti Veneti a Roma. Venezia, 1885.
 ——— Martiri del libero pensiero e vittime della Santa Inquisizione nei secoli XVI., XVII., e XVIII. Roma, 1891.
Biaudet, Henri, Les nonciatures apostoliques permanentes jusqu'en 1648 (Annales academiae scientiarum fennica. Series B., Vol. II., 1). Helsinki, 1910.
Bogolino, L. La Sicilia a i suoi cardinali. Palermo, 1884.
Bonanni, Ph. Numismata Pontificum Romanorum quæ a tempore Martini V. ad annum 1699 vel autoritate publica vel privato genio in lucem prodire. Vol. II., Romæ, 1699.
Bonazzi, L. Storia di Perugia. 2 vols., 1875–1879.
Bongi, S. Annali di Giolito de Ferrari da Trino di Monferrato, stampatore di Venezia. 2 vols. Roma, 1890 *seqq.*
Borgati, M. Castel di S. Angelo in Roma. Roma, 1890.
 [*Borgia, Franciscus*]. Sanctus Franciscus Borgia, quartus Gandiæ dux et Societatis Jesu præpositus generalis tertius. Vol. I., Matriti, 1894; Vol. II., 1903; vol. III., 1908.
Boverius, Z. Annales sive historiæ ordinis minorum S. Francisci qui Capuccini nuncupatur. 2 vols. Lugduni, 1632 *seq.*
Braunsberger, O., S.J. Beati Petri Canisii Epistolæ et Acta. Vols. I.–IV. Frib. Brisg., 1896–1905.
Brischar, N. Beurteilung der Kontroversen Sarpis und Palavicinis in der Geschichte des Trienter Konzils. Tübingen, 1844.
Bromato, C. Storia di Paolo IV., P. M. 2 vols. Ravenna, 1748–1753.
Brosch, M. Geschichte des Kirchenstaates. Vol. I., Gotha, 1880.
 ——— Geschichte Englands. Vol. VI. Gotha, 1890.
Brown, Rawdon, Calendar of State Papers and Manuscripts relating to English affairs in the archives of Venice and in other libraries of Northern Italy. Vols. V.–VII. London, 1873–1890.
Bucholtz, F. Br. Geschichte der Regierung Ferdinands I. 9 vols., Vienna, 1831–1838.
Bufalini, L. La pianta di Roma di L. B. del 1551. Riprodotta, con introduz. di F. Ehrle S.J. [Also under the title of Roma al tempo di Giulio III.]. Roma, 1911.
Bullarium Diplomatum et Privilegiorum Summorum Romanorum Pontificum, Taurinensis editio. Vol. VI. Aug. Taur., 1860; vol. VII., Neapoli, 1882.
Bullarium ordinis fratrum min. S. Franc. Capucinatorum. Vol. I. Romæ, 1740.
Bunsen-Platner, Beschreibung der Stadt Rom. 3 vols. Stuttgart and Tübingen, 1829–1842.
Burckhardt, J. Beiträge zur Kunstgeschichte von Italien. 2nd ed., Berlin and Stuttgart, 1911.
Buschbell, G. Reformation und Inquisition in Italien um die Mitte des 16 Jahrhunderts. Paderborn, 1910.
Cabrera, Felipe segundo. 4 vols. Madrid, 1876 *seq.*
Calenzio, G. Documenti inediti e nuovi lavori letterarii sul Concilio di Trento. Roma, 1874.

- Callari, L.* I Palazzi di Roma e le case di pregio storico ed artistico. Roma, 1907.
- Campori, G.* CIII. Lettere inedite di Sommi Pontefici. Modena, 1878.
- Cancellieri, Fr.* Storia dei solenni Possessi dei Sommi Pontefici. Roma, 1802.
- Cancellieri, Fr.* Il Mercato, il Lago dell' Acqua Vergine ed il Palazzo Panfiliano nel Circo Agonale. Roma, 1811.
- Cantù, F.* Gli Eretici d'Italia. 3 vols. Torino, 1864-1866.
- Capecelatro, Card.* Der heilige Philippus Neri. Freib. i. Br., 1886. [Eng. Trans. by *T. A. Pope.*]
- Caracciolus, A.* De vita Pauli IV. P. M. Coloniae, 1612.
- Cardella, L.* Memorie storiche de' cardinali della s. Romana chiesa. Vol. IV. Roma, 1793.
- Caro, A.* Lettere colla vita dell' autore scritta da *A. F. Seghezzi.* 3 vols. Milano, 1807.
- Caro, A.* Lettere scritte a nome del Card. A. Farnese. 3 vols. Milano, 1807.
- Cartas di S. Ignacio, see* Ignatius de Loiola.
- Carte Strozziene*: Inventario. 1st series, 2 vols. Firenze, 1884.
- Casa, Giov. della,* Opere. 6 vols. Napoli, 1733.
- Castaldo, G. B.* Vita del S. Pontefice Paolo IV. Roma, 1615.
- Cavalcanti, B.* Lettere tratte dagli originali. Bologna, 1869.
- Charrière, E.* Négociations de la France dans le Levant (Collect. d. docum. inéd. pour l'hist. de France). Vol. I. Paris, 1848.
- Chattard, Giov. P.,* Nuova descrizione del Vaticano. Vols. I.-III. Roma, 1762-1767.
- Chiesi, L.* Papa Giulio III. e la guerra di Parma e della Mirandola secondo il carteggio d'Ippolito Capilupi con Ferrante Gonzaga: Atti e Memorie della r. deput. di stor. patria per le prov. Modenese. 4th series, vol. III. Modena, 1892.
- Ciaconius, Alph.* Vita et res gestæ Pont. Romanorum et S.R.E. Cardinalium ab Aug. Oldoino recognita. Vol. III. Romæ, 1677.
- Ciampi, S.* Bibliografia critica delle corrispondenze dell' Italia colla Russia, colla Polonia, etc. 3 vols. Firenze, 1834-1842.
- Clausse.* Les San Gallo. 3 vols. Paris, 1900-1902.
- Clementi, F.* Il Carnevale Romano nelle cronache contemporanee. Roma, 1899.
- Coggiola, G.* I. Farnesi ed il conclave di Paolo IV. con documenti inediti: Studi storici IX., 61-91, 203-227, 449-479, Pisa, 1900.
- Paolo IV. e la capitolazione segreta di Cavi. Pistoia, 1900.
- Ascanio della Cornia e la sua condotta negli avvenimenti del 1555 a 1556: Bullettino della r. deput. di stor. patria per l'Umbria, X., 89-148, 221-362, Perugia, 1904.
- I. Farnesi ed il ducato di Parma e Piacenza durante il pontificato di Paolo IV.: Archiv. stor. per le prov. Parmensi, Nuova Serie, III., 1-282, Parma, 1905.
- Condivi, A.* Das Leben des Michelangelo Buonarroti. Vienna, 1874.

- Coppi, A.* Discorso sopra le finanze di Roma nei secoli di mezzo. Roma, 1847.
- *Memorie Colonnese* compilate. Roma, 1855.
- Corpo diplomatico Portuguez*, p.p. *Luiz Aug. Rebella da Silva* Vols. 6-7, Lisbon, 1884 *seq.*
- Corpus Reformatorum.* Philippi Melancthonis opera quæ supersunt omnia, edidit C. G. *Bretschneider*. Vol. I. *seqq.*, Halis Sax, 1834 *seqq.*
- Cros, J. M.* St. François de Xavier. Sa vie et ses lettres. 2 vols., Toulouse, 1900.
- Cugnoni, G.* Prose inedite del Comm. Anibale Caro, pubbl. e annotate da G. C. Imola, 1872.
- Cupis, C. de* Le vicende dell' agricoltura e della pastorizia dell' agro Romano e l'Annona di Roma. Roma, 1911.
- Dandolo, Matteo.* Relazione di Roma 1551 (In *Albèri*, Relazioni degli ambasciatori Veneti. 2nd series, vol. III., 331 *seqq.* Firenze, 1846).
- Dembinski, B.* De Beschickung des Tridentinums durch Polen. Breslau, 1883.
- Rzym i Europa. Vol. I. Krakau, 1890.
- Dengel, J.* Geschichte des Palazzo di S. Marco, genannt Palazzo di Venezia. Leipzig, 1909.
- Desjardins, A.* Négociations diplomatiques de la France avec la Toscane. Documents recueillis par Gius. Canestrini. Vol. I. *seqq.*, Paris, 1859 *seq.*
- Desjob.* L'influence du Concile de Trente sur la littérature et les beaux-arts. Paris, 1884.
- Dierauer, J.* Geschichte der schweizerischen Eidgenossenschaft. Vols. I.-III., Gotha, 1887 *seqq.*
- Dionysius, P. L. and Aug. de Gabriellis,* Sacrarum Vaticanæ basilicæ cryptarum monumenta aeneis tabulis incisa et commentariis illustrata. Romæ, 1773.
- Dispacci di Germania.* Publ. by the Historischen Kommission der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften. Vols. I.-III. Ed. by *Turba*. Vienna, 1889-1895.
- Documenta ad legationem Cardinalis Poli spectantia.* Romæ, 1896. (For private circulation).
- Döllinger, J. J.* Beiträge zur politischen, kirchlichen und Kulturgeschichte der sechs letzten Jahrhunderte. Vols. II., III., Regensburg and Vienna, 1863-1882.
- Druffel, A. von,* Briefe und Akten zur Geschichte des 16 Jahrhunderts mit besonderer Rücksichtnahme auf Bayerns Fürstenhaus. Vols. I.-IV., Munich, 1873 *seq.*
- Dufresne, D.* Les Cryptes Vaticanes. Paris-Rome, 1902.
- Duhr, B., S. J.,* Geschichte der Jesuiten in den Ländern deutscher Zunge im XVI. Jahrhundert. Vol. I., Freib. i. Br., 1907.
- Duruy, G.* Le cardinal Carlo Carafa (1519-1561). Étude sur le pontificat de Paul IV. Paris, 1882.
- Ebe, G.* Die Spätrenaissance. Vol. I. Berlin, 1886.
- Egger, H.* Römische Veduten. Handzeichnungen aus dem 15-18 Jahrhundert. Vienna und Leipzig, 1911.

- Ehrenberg, H.* Urkunden und Aktenstücke zur Geschichte der in der heutigen Provinz Posen vereinigten ehemals polnischen Landesteile. Leipzig, 1892.
- Ehrle, F.* See *Bufalini*.
- Roma prima di Sisto V. La pianta di Roma Du Pérac-Lafréry del 1577. Roma, 1908.
- Ehses, St.* Concilium Tridentinum. Vols. IV., V., Actorum pars 1 and 2. Frib. Brig., 1904, 1911.
- Eichhorn, A.* Der ermländische Bischof und Kardinal Stanislaus Hosius. 2 vols., Mayence, 1854–1855.
- Epistolæ mixtæ ex variis Europæ locis ab anno 1537 ad 1556 scriptæ, nunc primum a Patribus Societatis Jesu in lucem editæ.* 5 vols., Matriti, 1898–1901.
- Epistolæ P. Alphonsi Salmeronis S. J. ex autographis vel originalibus exemplis potissimum depromptæ a Patribus eiusdem Soc. nunc primum editæ.* Vols. I, II. (1536–1585). Matriti, 1906, 1907.
- Epistolæ p.p. Pasch. Broti, Claudii Jaji, Joannis Codarii et Simonis Roderici* Soc. Jesu. Matriti, 1903.
- Epistolæ quadrimestres ex universis præter Indiam et Brasiliam locis, in quibus aliqui de Societate Jesu versabantur, Romam missæ.* Vols. I.–IV. Matriti, 1894–1900.
- Erulei, R.* La Villa di Giulio III. suoi usi e destinazioni: Nuova Antologia, Roma, 1890.
- Escher, Konrad,* Barock und Klassizismus. Studien zur Geschichte der Architektur Roms. Leipzig [1910].
- Études.* Revue fondée en 1856 par des Pères de la Cie de Jésus. Paris, 1856 *seqq.*
- Eymericus, N.* Directorium Inquisitorum cum commentario *Franc. Pegnæ.* Romæ, 1587.
- Fabricius, G.* Roma. Basileæ, 1551.
- Fanfani, Spigolatura Michelangelo.* Firenze, 1876.
- Fantuzzi, G.* Notizie degli scrittori Bolognesi. 9 vols. Bologna, 1871–1794.
- Favre, J.* Olivier de Magny (1529–1561). Paris, 1885.
- Ferri, A.* L'Architettura in Roma nei secoli XV. e XVI. Roma, 1867.
- Fichard, J.* Italia (Frankfurtischen Archiv für ältere deutsche Literatur und Geschichte). Frankfurt a. M., 1875.
- Firmani, Lud.* Bondoni de Branchis. Diaria cæremonialia, ed. S. Merkle, Concil. Trid. II., Friburgi Brisq., 1911.
- Fontana, B.* Documenti Vaticani contro l'heresia Luterana in Italia. Archivio della Soc. Rom. di storia patria, XV., Roma, 1892.
- Renata di Francia, duchessa di Ferrara. 3 vols., Roma, 1889–1894.
- [*Fontanini*] Della istoria del dominio temporale della Sede Apos. nel Ducato di Parma e Piacenza. Roma, 1720.
- Forcella, V.* Iscrizioni delle chiese e d'altri edifice di Roma dal secolo XI. fino ai giorni nostri. 14 vols. Roma, 1869–1885.

- Fouqueray, H.* Histoire de la Compagnie de Jésus en France. Vol. I. Les Origines et les premières luttas. Paris, 1910.
- Friedensburg*, see *Nuntiaturberichte*.
- Friedländer, W.* Das Kasino Pius' IV. Leipzig, 1912.
- Fueter, E.* Geschichte der neueren Historiographie. Munich, 1911.
- Fumi, L.* L'Inquisizione Romana e lo stata di Milano. Milano, 1910.
- Gachard, L.* Correspondance de Philippe II. sur les affaires des Pays-Bas. Vol. I., Bruxelles, 1848.
- Les Archives du Vatican. Bruxelles 1874.
- Gairdner, H.* The English Church in the sixteenth century from the accession of Henry VIII. to the death of Mary. London, 1902.
- Gams, B.* Series episcoporum ecclesiæ catholicæ. Ratisbonæ. 1873.
- Garampi, G.* Saggi di osservazioni sul valore delle antiche monete pontificie con appendice di documenti. [Roma, 1766].
- Gatticus, I. B.* Acta cæremonialia S. Romana ecclesiæ ex MSS. codicibus. Vol. I. Romæ, 1753.
- Gayangos, P. de*, Calendar of Letters, Despatches and State Papers, relating to the negotiations between England and Spain preserved in the Archives of Simancas and elsewhere. Vols. V.-VIII., London, 1886-1904.
- Gaye, E. G.* Carteggio inedito d'artisti dei secoli XV.-XVII 3 vols. Firenze, 1840.
- Geijer, C. G.* Geschichte Schwedens. 3 vols. Hamburg, 1832-1836.
- Geymüller, H. von.* Die ursprünglichen Entwürfe für St. Peter in Rom. 2 vols. Vienna and Paris, 1875-1880.
- Michelangelo Buonarroti als Architekt. München, 1904 (Vol. VIII. of Der Architektur der Renaissance in Toskana).
- Giordani, P.* Il Vignola a Roma (Memorie e studi interno a Jacopo Barozzi). Vignola, 1908.
- Giornale Storico della letteratura Italiana.* Vols. I. *seqq.* Roma—Torino—Firenze, 1883 *seqq.*
- Gnoli, D.* Have Roma. Chiese, Monumenti, Case, Palazzi, Piazze, Fontane, Ville. Roma, 1909.
- Göller, Emil.* Die päpsliche Pönitentiare von ihrem Ursprung bis zu ihrer Umgestaltung unter Pius V. Vol. II., Rom., 1911 (Bibliothek des Kgl. Preussischen Historischen Instituts in Rom, vols. 7 and 8).
- Gori, F.* Archivio storico, artistico, archeologico e letterario della città e provincia di Roma. Vols. I.-IV., Roma e Spoleto, 1875-1883.
- Gothein, E.* Ignatius von Loyola und die Gegenreformation. Halle, 1895.
- Graf, A.* Attraverso il Cinquecento. Torino, 1888.
- Gratianus, A. M.* De vita Joannis Francisci Commendoni Cardinalis. Parisiis, 1669.

- Grätz, H.* Geschichte der Juden bis auf die Gegenwart. 11 vols. Leipzig, 1866.
- Gregorovius, F.* Geschichte der Stadt Rom im Mittelalter. Vols. VI., VII., 3rd ed. Stuttgart, 1879-1880.
- Grimm, H.* Leben Michelangelos. 2 vols., 5th ed. Berlin, 1879.
- Guglielmotti, Alb.* La guerra dei pirati dal 1500 al 1560. 2 vols. Firenze, 1876.
- Storia delle fortificazioni nella spiaggia Roma. Roma, 1880.
- Guhl, E.* Künstlerbriefe. 2 vols., 2nd ed. Berlin, 1880.
- Gulik, W. van.* Johannes Gropper (1503-1559). Ein Beiträge zur Kirchengeschichte Deutschlands, besonders der Rheinlande im 16 Jahrhundert. Freib. i. Br., 1906.
- Gulik-Eubel.* Hierarchia Catholica medii ævi. Vol. III., saec. XVI. ab anno 1503 complectens. Monasterii, 1910.
- Gurlitt, C.* Geschichte des Barockstiles in Italien. Stuttgart, 1887.
- Haas, H.* Geschichte des Christenthums in Japan. Vol. I., Tokio, 1902.
- Häberlin, Fr. D.* Neueste teutsche Reichsgeschichte, vom Anfange des Schmalkaldischen Krieges bis auf unsere Zeiten. 20 vols., Halle, 1774-1786.
- Haefner, H.* Lehrbuch der Geschichte der Medizin und der epidemischen Krankheiten. Vols. I. and III. Jena, 1875-1882.
- Hefner, J.* Die Entstehungsgeschichte des Trienter Rechtfertigungsdekrets. Paderborn, 1909.
- Heimbucher, M.* Die Orden und Kongregationen der katholischen Kirche. 3 vols., 2nd ed. Paderborn, 1907-1908.
- Helbig, W.* Führer durch die öffentlichen Sammlungen klassischer Altertümer in Rom. 2 vols., 2nd ed. Leipzig, 1899.
- Hergenröther, J.* Katholische Kirche und christlicher Staat. Freib. i. Br., 1872.
- Hermanin, F.* Die Stadt Rom im 15 und 16 Jahrhundert. Leipzig, 1911.
- Herre, P.* Papsttum und Papstwahl im Zeitalter Philipps II. Leipzig, 1907.
- Herzog, J. J.* Real-Enzyklopädie. Vols. I.-XXI., 3rd ed., Leipzig, 1896-1908.
- Hilgers, J., S. J.* Der Index der verbotenen Bücher. Freib. i. Br., 1904.
- Hinojosa, Ricardo de.* Los despachos de la diplomacia pontificia en España. Vol. I. Madrid, 1896.
- Hinschius, P.* System des katholischen Kirchenrechts. Berlin, 1869.
- Holzwarth, F. J.* Der Abfall der Niederlande. 2 vols. Schaffhausen, 1865-1872.
- Hoogewerff, G. J.* Nederlandsche Schilders in Italie in de XVI. eeuw. Utrecht, 1912.
- Hosii, St.* Epistola. Vol. 2 (1551-1558). Ed. F. Hipler et V. Zarkzewski. Cracovia, 1886-1888.

- Huber, A.* Geschichte Österreichs. Vols. III. and IV. Gotha, 1888–1892.
- Hubert, F.* Vergerios publizistische Tätigkeit. Göttingen, 1893.
- Hübner, P. G.* Le Statue di Roma. Vol. I. Quellen und Sammlungen. Leipzig, 1912.
- Hülsen und Egger.* Die römischen Skizzenbücher des Marten van Heemskerck. Vol. I., Berlin, 1913.
- Ignatius de Loiola.* Cartas. 6 vols. Madrid, 1874–1889.
- Janssen, J.* Geschichte des deutschen Volkes seit dem Ausgang des Mittelalters. Vol. I. to III., 17th and 18th ed. Freib. i. Br., 1897–1899.
- Kallab, W.* Vasari-Studien. Wien, 1908.
- Kerker, M.* Reginald Pole. Freib. i. Br., 1874.
- Kervyn de Lettenhove.* Relations politiques des Pays-Bas et de l'Angleterre sous Philippe II. Vol. I. Bruxelles, 1882.
- Koch, M.* Untersuchungen über die Empörung und die Abfall der Neiderlande von Spanien. Leipzig, 1860.
- Krasinski, V. A.* Geschichte der Reformation in Polen. Leipzig, 1841.
- Kraus, F. X.* Geschichte der christlichen Kunst. 2 vols. Freib. i. Br., 1908.
- Krones, F. von.* Handbuch der Geschichte Österreichs. Vol. III. Berlin, 1877.
- Laemmer, H.* Zur Kirchengeschichte des 16 und 17 Jahrhunderts. Freib. i. Br., 1863.
- Meletematum Romanorum mantissa. Ratisbonæ, 1875.
- Monumenta Vaticana historiam ecclesiasticam saeculi XVI. illustrantia. Friburgi Brisg., 1861.
- Lanciani, R.* Storia degli Scavi di Roma. Vols. I. to III. Roma, 1902–1908.
- The golden days of the Renaissance in Rome. London, 1907.
- Lanssac, M. de* (Louis de Saint-Gelais). Correspondance politique, p.p. Charles Sauzé, 1548–1557. Archives hist. du Poitou. Vol. XXXIII., 1904.
- Lanz, K.* Korrespondenz des Kaisers Karl V., aus dem Kgl. Archiv und der "Biblioth de Bourgogne" zu Brüssel. 3 vols. Leipzig, 1844–1846.
- Latinius, Latimus.* Lucubrationes. Vol. II. Epistolæ, coniecturæ et observationes sacra profanaque eruditione ornata. Romæ et Viterbii, 1659, 1667.
- Lauchert, F.* Die italienischen literarischen Gegner Luthers. Freib. i. Br., 1912.
- Laugwitz.* Bartholomäus Carranza, Erzbischof von Toledo. Kempten, 1870.
- Legazioni di A. Serristori,* ambasciatore di Cosimo I. a Carlo V. e in corte di Roma, con note di G. Canestrini, pubbl. dal conte Luigi Serristori. Firenze, 1853.
- Le Plat, J.* Monumentorum ad hist. concilii Tridentini collectio. 7 vols. Lovanii, 1781–1787.

- Letarouilly, P.* Edifices de Rome moderne. Paris, 1868.
Lettere al Aretino. Venezia, 1552.
Lettere de'principi. 3 vols., 3rd ed. Venezia, 1570-1577.
Leva, G. de. Storia documentata di Carlo V. in correlazione all'Italia. Vols. I.-V. Venezia, Padova, Bologna, 1863-1895.
Lili, C. Historia di Camerino. Macerata, 1652.
Lingard, J. History of England. Vol. VII. London, 1838.
Litta, P. Famiglie celebri Italiane. Disp. 1-183, Milano e Torino, 1819-1881.
Llorente, J. A. Geschichte der spanischen Inquisition. 4 vols. Gmünd, 1819-1822.
Lossen, M. Briefe des Andreas Masius und seine Freunde (1538-1573). Leipzig, 1886.
Lütolf, A. Die Schweizergarde in Rom, ihre Bedeutung und ihre Wirkungen im 16 Jahrhundert. Einsiedeln, 1859.
Luzio, A. Un prognostico satirico di Pietro Aretino (1534). Bergamo, 1900.
- Mackowsky, H.* Michelangniolo. Berlin, 1908.
Manareus, Olivierus, S.J. De rebus Societatis Jesu Commentarius. Florentiæ, 1886 (privately printed).
Marcks, E. Gaspar von Coligny. Sein Leben und das Frankreich seiner zeit. Vol. I. Stuttgart, 1892.
Manni, D. M. Istoria degli anni santi dal loro principio fino al presenta del MDCCL. Firenze, 1750.
Marcellino da Civezza. Storia universale delle Missioni Franciscane. Vols. VI., VII. Prato, 1881 *seq.*
Marini, G. Degli architetti pontifici. Vols. I., II. Roma, 1748.
Marocco, G. Monumenti dello Stato Pontificio. Vols. I.-XII., Roma, 1833-1836.
Martin, J. F. Le Cardinal Pole. Bulletin de l'archiconfraternité de N. D. de Compassion. IV., 335-352; V., 92-118; VI., 43-59. Paris, 1903-1905.
Masius, A. Briefe. See *Lossen*.
Massarelli, Angelo. Diaria V.-VII., ed. S. Merkle, Concil. Trid. II. Friburgi Brisg., 1911.
Maurenbrecher, W. Karl V. und die deutschen Protestanten 1545-1555. Düsseldorf, 1885.
Maynier, L. Etude historique sur le concile de Trente. Paris, 1874.
Mazzuchelli, G. M. Gli scrittori d'Italia. 2 vols. Brescia, 1753.
Meaux, de. Les luttes religieuses en France au 16^{me} siècle. Paris, 1879.
Menzel, K. A. Neuere Geschichte der Deutschen seit der Reformation. Vol. I. *seqq.*, 2nd ed. Breslau, 1854 *seq.*
Mercati, G. Per la storia della Biblioteca Apostolica bibliotecario Cesare Baronio. Perugia, 1910.
Merkle, S. Concilii Tridentini Diariorum, Pars I. et II. Collegit, edidit, illustravit. Friburgi, Brisg., 1901, 1911.
Meyer, A. O. England und die katholische Kirche unter Elisabeth Rom, 1911 [English transl. by J. R. McKee (Cong. Orat)].

- Michaelis, A.* Geschichte des Statuenhofes im vaticanischen Belvedere: Jahrbuch des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, V., Berlin, 1891.
- Römische Skizzenbücher Marten van Heemskerks und anderer nordischer Künstler des 16 Jahrhunderts.: Jahrbuch des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, VI., 125-172, 218-238; VII., 83-105. Berlin, 1892-1893.
- Michelangelo.* Lettere pubblicate coi ricordi ed i contratti artistici, per cura di G. *Milanesi*. Firenze, 1875.
- Mocenigo, Luigi.* Relazione di Roma, 1560. *Albèri*, Relazioni, 2nd series, vol. IV. Firenze, 1857.
- Monumenta Ignatiana* ex autographis vel ex antiquioribus exemplis collecta. Series I., Sancti Ignatii de Loyola Epistolae et Instructiones, 6 vols., Matriti, 1903-1907. Series IV. Scripta de Sancto Ignatio de Loyola, vol. I. Matriti, 1904.
- Monumenta Xaveriana* ex autographis vel ex antiquioribus exemplis collecta. Vol. I. Matriti, 1900.
- Moroni, G.* Dizionario di erudizione storico-ecclesiastico da S. Pietro sino ai nostri giorni. 109 vols. Venezia, 1840-1879.
- Müllbauer, Max.* Geschichte der Katholischen Missionen in Ostindien von Vasco di Gama bis zur Mitte des 18 Jahrhunderts. Munich, 1851.
- Müller, Th.* Das Konklave Pius IV., 1559. Gotha, 1889.
- Müntz., E.* La Bibliothèque du Vatican au XVI.^e siècle. Paris, 1886.
- Historie de l'Art pendant la Renaissance. Italie. 3 vols. Paris, 1889-1895.
- Muzio, Girol.* Lettere conservate nell' Archivio di Parma. ed. A. *Ronchini*. Parma [1864].
- Nadal, H., S.J.* Epistolæ et anno 1546 ad 1577 nunc primum editæ. 4 vols. Matriti, 1898-1905.
- Navagero, Bern.* Relazione di Roma 1558, in *Albèri*, Relazioni, 2nd series, vol. III. Firenze, 1846.
- Noack, F.* Das deutsche Rom. Rom, 1912.
- Nonciatures de France.* See *Ancel*.
- Nores, Pietro.* Storia della guerra di Paolo IV., contro gli Spagnuoli corredata di documenti (Archivio stor. Italiano, Series I, vol. XII.). Firenze, 1847.
- Novaes, G. de.* Storia de' pontefici. Vol. VII. Roma, 1822.
- Nuntiaturberichte* aus Deutschland nebst ergänzenden Aktentücken. Im Auftrag des Königl. Preussischen Instituts, von W. *Friedensburg*. Vols. I.-VI. and VIII.-X. Gotha, 1892-1908.
- Oldecop, Joh.* Chronik, herausg. von K. *Euling* in der Bibliothek des Literarischen Vereins in Stuttgart. Vol. 190. Tübingen, 1891.
- Orano, D.* Liberi pensatori. Roma, 1904.
- Orlandinus, N.* Historia Societatis Jesu. Prima pars. Romæ, 1650.
- Padiglione, C.* La Biblioteca del Museo Nazionale nella Certosa di S. Martino in Napoli ed i suoi manoscritti. Napoli, 1876.

- Pagliucchi, P.* I Castellani del Castel S. Angelo di Roma con documenti inediti relativi alla storia della Mole Adriana tolti dall' Archivio Segreto Vaticano e da altri archivi. Vol. I., pars. 2. I Castellani Vescovi (1464-1566). Roma, 1909.
- Palandri, E. P.* Les Négociations politiques et religieuses entre la Toscane et la France à l'époque de Cosme I et de Catherine de Medicis (1544-1580) d'après les documents des archives de l'état à Florence et à Paris. Paris, 1908.
- Pallavicini, Sf.* Istoria del Concilio di Trento. 3 vols. Roma, 1664.
- Palmieri, G.* Ad Vaticanani archivi Romanorum pontificum Regesta manducatio Romæ, 1884.
- Pasini-Frassoni.* Armorial des Papes. Rome, 1906.
- [*Passarini, L.*] Memorie intorno alla vita di Silvestro Aldobrandini con appendice di documenti. Roma, 1878.
- Pastor, L.* Die kirklichen Reunionsbestrebungen während der Regierung Karls V. Freiburg, 1879.
- Allgemeine Dekrete der Römischen Inquisition aus den Jahren 1555 bis 1597. Nach dem Notariatsprotokoll des S. Uffizio. Freib. i. Br., 1912.
- Petramellarius, Jo Ant.* Ad librum O. Panvinii de Summis Pontif. et S. R. E. cardinalibus a Paulo IV. ad Clementis VIII. annum pontificatus octavum continuatio. Bononiæ, 1599.
- Petrucelli della Gattina, F.* Histoire diplomatique des Conclaves. Vol. II. Paris, 1864.
- Pieper, A.* Die päpstlichen Legaten und Nuntien in Deutschland, Frankreich und Spanien seit der Mitte des 16 Jahr hunderts. Part i: Die Legaten und Nuntien Julius' III., Marcellus' II. und Pauls' IV. (1550-1559) und ihre Instruktionen. Münster, 1897.
- Pierling, P.* La Russie et la Saint-Siége. Vol. I. Paris, 1896.
- Pirenne, H.* Geschichte Belgiens. Vol. III. (1477-1567). Gotha, 1907.
- Plon, C.* Cellini orfèvre, médailleur, sculpteur. Recherches sur sa vie, sur son œuvre et sur les pièces qui lui sont attribuées. Paris, 1883.
- Pogiani, Julii.* Sunensis epistolæ et orationes olim collectæ ab Antonio Maria Gratiano nunc ab Hieronymo Lagomarsinio a Soc. Jesu adnotationibus illustratæ ac primum editæ. Vols. I.-IV. Romæ, 1762.
- Polanco, S. A. de, S. J.* Vita Ignatii Loiolæ, Matriti, 1894-98.
- Pollidorus, P.* De Vita, gestis et moribus Marcelli II. Romæ, 1744.
- Postina, A.* Der Karmelit Eberhard Billick. Freib. i. Br., 1901.
- Quellen* und Forschungen aus italianischen Bibliotheken und Archiven. Herausg. von dem Preuss. Histor. Institut. Vol. I. seqq., Rom, 1898 seqq.
- Quétif-Echard,* Scriptores ordinis Prædicatorum recensiti notisque historicis et criticis illustrati, etc. Vol. I. Lut. Parisior, 1719.

- Quirini, A. M.* Collectio Epistolarum Reginaldi Poli. 5 vols. Brixiae, 1744-1757.
- Rachfahl, F.* Wilhelm von Oranien und der niederländische Aufstand. Vol. I. Halle a.S., 1906.
- Ranke, L. von.* Englische Geschichte. Vol. I. Berlin, 1859.
 — Die römische Päpste in den letzten vier Jahrhunderten. Vols. I. and III., 6th ed. Leipzig, 1874.
 — Deutsche Geschichte im Zeitalter der Reformation. Vols. III.-VI., 6th ed. Leipzig, 1881.
- Raynaldus, O.* Annales ecclesiastici. Vols. XIV., XV. Lucæ, 1755-1756.
- Reimann, C.* Der Streit zwischen Papsttum und Kaisertum im Jahre, 1558: Forschungen zur deutschen Geschichte, V. Göttingen, 1865.
 — Papst Paul IV. und das Kaisertum: Abhandlungen der Schlesischen Gesellschaft für vaterländische Kultur. Phil.-hist. Abteilung, 1871.
- Reinhardt, H., und Steffens, F.* Die Nuntiatur von Giovanni Francesco Bonhomini, 1579-1581. Introduction: Studien zur Geschichte der katholischen Schweiz im Zeitalter Carlo Borromeos. Solothurn, 1910.
- Relacye Nuncyuszów Apostolskich i innych osób o Polsce od roku 1548 do 1690*, ed. *E. Rykaczewski*. Vol. I., Berlin Poznan, 1864.
- Renazzi, F. M.* Storia dell' università degli studi di Roma, detta la Sapienza. 2 vols. Roma, 1803-1804.
- Reumont, A.* Die Carafa von Maddaloni. Vol. I. Berlin, 1851.
 — Geschichte der Stadt Rom. Vol. III. Berlin, 1870.
 — Geschichte Toskanas. Gotha, 1876.
- Reusch, H.* Der Index der verbotenenen Bücher. 2 vols. Bonn, 1883-1885.
- Ribier, G.* Lettres et Mémoires d'Estat, des roys, princes, ambassadeurs et autres ministres sous les règnes de François I., Henri II. et François II. 2 vols. Paris, 1866.
- Rieger, P. and Vogelstein, H.* Geschichte der Juden in Rom. 2 vols. Berlin, 1895-1896.
- Riegl, Alois.* Die Entstehung der Barockkunst in Rom. Akademische Vorlesungen. Vienna, 1908.
- Riess, L.* Die Politik Pauls IV. und seiner Nepoten. Eine weltgeschichtliche Krisis des 16 Jahrh. (Historische Studien Heft 67). Berlin, 1909.
- Riezler, S.* Geschichte Bayerns. Vol. IV. Gotha, 1899.
- Ripoll-Brémont.* Bullarium Ord. Praedicatorum. Vol. IV. Romæ, 1732.
- Ritter, M.* Deutsche Geschichte im Zeitalter der Gegenreformation und des Dreissigjährigen Krieges (1555-1648). Vol. I., 1555-1586. Stuttgart, 1889.
- Rocchi, E.* Le piante iconografiche e prospettive di Roma del secolo XVI. colla riproduzione degli studi originali autografi di A. da Sangallo il Giovane per le fortificazioni di Roma, etc. Torino-Roma, 1902.

- Rodocanachi, E.* Le Saint-Siège et les Juifs. Le ghetto à Rome. Paris, 1891.
- Le Capitole Romain antique et moderne. Paris, 1904.
- Le château Saint-Ange. Paris, 1909.
- Rome au temps de Jules II. et de Léon X. Paris, 1912.
- Romier, L.* La crise gallicane de 1551 : Revue historique, CVIII., 225-250 ; CIX., 27-55. Paris, 1911-1912.
- [*Ronchini, A.*] Lettere d'Uomini illustri conservate in Parma nel R. Archivio dello Stato. Vol. I. Parma, 1853.
- Roseo, Mambrino.* Della historie del mondo, Parte III. Aggiunta alle historie di *Giov. Tarcagnota*. Venezia, 1598.
- Rot, Matthæus.* Itinerarium Romanicum anno domini 1554. Herausg. von *Gmelin* in der Zeitschrift für Geschichte des Oberrheins, XXXII. Karlsruhe, 1880.
- Sägmüller, J. B.* Die Papstwahlbullen und das staatliche Recht der Exklusive. Tübingen, 1892.
- Die Papstwahlen (1447-1555). Tübingen, 1890.
- Samm, Ch. de.* Une question Italienne au XVI.^e siècle. Paris, 1861.
- Sandonini, L.* Castelvetro. Bologna, 1882.
- Santarem (Visconde de),* Quadro elementar das relações politicas e diplomaticas de Portugal com as diversas potencias do mundo tesdo a principio da Monarchia portugaeza ate aos nossos dias. Vol. III. Lisboa, 1874.
- Sarpi [Pietro Soave Polano].* Historia del concilio Tridentino. 4th ed., Genova, 1660.
- Sauzé, see Lanssac.*
- Scarabelli, Luciano.* Summarii delle cose notabili seguite in Roma dal principio d'aprile 1556 a tutto guigno 1557, scritti verisimilmente da Fr. Babbi (Archivio storico Ital. XII., 345 seqq.) Firenze, 1847.
- Schäfer, E.* Beiträge zur Geschichte des spanischen Protestantismus und der Inquisition im 16 Jahrhundert. Vols. I. seqq., Gütersloh, 1902.
- Schäfer, H.* Geschichte Portugals. 5 vols. Hamburg, 1836-1854.
- Schmid, J.* Die deutsche Kaiser-und-Königswahl und die römische Kurie in den Jahren 1538-1620 (Historisches Jahrbuch der Görres-Gesellschaft, Vol. VI.), München, 1885.
- Schmidlin, J.* Geschichte der deutschen Nationalkirche in Rom S. Maria dell' Anima. Freib. i. Br., 1906.
- Schroeder, Frid.* Monumenta, qua spectant primordia Collegii Germanici et Hungaria. Roma, 1896.
- Schweitzer, V.* Zur Geschichte der Reform unter Julius III. Fünf Vorträge der Paderborner Generalversammlung der Görres-Gesellschaft. Köln, 1907.
- Sclopis.* Le Card. Morone. Paris, 1869.
- Segmüller, F.* Die Wahl des Papstes Paul IV. und die Obediengesandtschaft der Eidgenossen : Zeitschrift für schweizerische Kirchengeschichte III. Stans, 1909.
- Segni, B.* Storie Fiorentine. 4 vols. Livorno, 1830.
- Selecta Indiarum Epistolæ* nunc primum editæ. Florentiæ, 1887.

- Serafini, C.* Le Monete e le bulle plumbee pontificie del Medagliere Vaticano. Vol. I., Roma, 1910.
- Seripando, Gir.* Eigenhändige Notizen des berühmten Augustinergenerals Seripand über die Päpste seiner Zeit. Herausg. v. *C. Hoffler* in dem Analekten zur Geschichte Deutschlands und Italiens. (Kgl. Bayr. Akademie der Wissenschaften. Vol. IV., 2nd par., 51 seqq.). München, 1846.
- Serristori.* See *Legazioni*.
- Sickel, Th.* Zur Geschichte des Konzils von Trient. Aktensücke aus den Österreichischen Archiven. Vienna, 1872.
- Silos, I.* Historia Clericor. Regular. a congregatione condita. Pars I. Roma, 1650.
- Simonetti, E.* I Nomi delle Vie de Roma. Saggio d'illustrazioni storiche con tre appendici. Roma, 1898.
- Sleidans* Briefwechsel. See *Baumgarten*.
- Soldan, M. G.* Geschichte des Protestantismus in Frankreich. Vol. I. Leipzig, 1855.
- Sommervogel, C., S.J.* Bibliothèque de la Compagnie de Jésus. 9 vols. Bruxelles-Paris, 1890-1900.
- Sozzini, Aless.* Diario della cose avvenute in Siena dal 20 Luglio 1550 al 28 Giugno 1555. Archivio storico Ital. II. Firenze, 1842.
- Spillmann, J., S.J.* Geschichte der Katholikenverfolgung in England, 1535-1681. Die englischen Märtyrer der Glaubensspaltung. Vol. I. Die Blutzengen unter Heinrich VIII. 2nd ed. Freib. i. Br., 1900.
- Steinherz, S.* Nuntiaturberichte aus Deutschland, 1560-1572. Vol. I. Vienna, 1897.
- Steinhuber, Andr.* Geschichte des Kollegium Germanikum Hungarikum in Rom. Vol. I., 2nd ed. Freiburg, 1906.
- Stettiner, Pietro.* Roma nei suoi monumenti. Roma, 1911.
- Stevenson, J.* Calendar of State Papers. Foreign Series. Elizabeth, 1558-1565. Vols. I.-VII. London, 1863-1870.
- Studi e documenti di storia e diritto.* Pubblicazione periodica dell' Accademia di conferenze storico-giuridiche. Vols. I. seqq. Roma, 1880 seqq.
- Summarii.* See *Scarabelli*.
- Swiney, Mac.* Le Portugal et le Saint-Siège. Vols. I. and III., Paris, 1898, 1904.
- Tacchi Venturi, P., S.J.* Storia della Compagnia di Gesù in Italia. Vol. I. Roma, 1909.
- Tarducci, D. A.* L'Atanagi da Cagli. Cagli, 1904.
- Tesoroni, D.* Il Palazzo di Firenze e l'eredità di Balduino del Monte, fratello di papa Giulio III. Roma, 1889.
- Theiner, A.* Vetera Monumenta Poloniæ et Lithuanicæ. 2 vols. Roma, 1861.
- Codex diplomaticus dominii temporalis S. Sedis. Recueil de documents pour servir à l'histoire du gouvernement temporel des états du Saint-Siège, extraits des Archives du Vatican. Vol. III., 1389-1793. Rome, 1862.
- Monumenta Slavorum meridionalium historiam illustrantia. Vol. I., 1198-1549. Roma, 1863.

- Theiner, A.* Acta genuina Concilii Tridentini. 2 vols. Agram, 1874.
- Thode, H.* Michelangelo und das Ende der Renaissance. 5 vols. Berlin, 1902-1908.
- Thomas, J.* Le Concordat de 1516. Ses origines, son histoire au XVI.^e siècle. 3^{me} partie, Paris, 1910.
- Thurston, H., S.J.* The Holy Year of Jubilee. An account of the history and ceremonial of the Roman Jubilee. London, 1900.
- Tiraboschi, G.* Storia della letteratura Italiana. 10 vols. Modena, 1772.
- Tomassetti, Guisepppe.* La Campagna Romana, antica, medievale e moderna. Vols. I., II., Roma, 1910.
- Torrighio, F. M.* Le sacre grotte Vaticane. Roma, 1639.
- Touron, O.P.* Histoire générale de l'Amérique. Vols. V., VI. Paris, 1768.
- Trésal, J.* Les origines du schisme Anglican (1509-1571). Paris, 1908.
- Turinozzi, Niccolo.* Diario Romano (1558-1560), pubbl. per P. Piccolomini. Roma, 1909.
- Turnbull.* Calendar of State Papers. Foreign. Reign of Mary, 1553-1558. London, 1861.
- Uebersberger, H.* Österreich und Russland seit dem Ende des 15 Jahrhunderts. Vol. I., 1488-1606. Vienna, 1906.
- Ughelli, F.* Italia Sacra. Ed. N. Coletus. 10 vols., Venetiis, 1717-1722.
- Vargas, F. de.* Lettres et Mémoires traduits de l'Espagnol avec des remarques par Michel Le Vassor. Amsterdam, 1700.
- Vasari, G.* Le vite de' più eccellenti pittori, scultori ed architettori. Nuova ediz. di G. Milanesi. Firenze, 1878 seqq.
- Venuti, R.* Numismata Romanorum Pontificum a Martino V. ad Benedictum XIV. Roma, 1744.
- Vitalis, A.* Correspondance politique de Dominique du Gabre. Paris, 1903.
- Vogelstein.* See *Rieger*.
- Völker.* Der Protestantismus in Polen auf Grund der einheimischen Geschichtschreibung. Leipzig, 1910.
- Wadding, I.* Annales Minorum. Ed. 2da. Vols. XIV. seqq., Romæ, 1735 seqq.
- Waal, A. de.* Der Campo Santo der Deutschen zu Rom. Freib. i. Br., 1896.
- Weiss, Ch.* Papiers d'État du Card. de Granvelle. Vols. I.-IV. Paris, 1841-1848.
- Willich, H.* Giac. Barozzi da Vignola. Strassburg, 1906.
- Wirz, C.* Ennio Filonardi, der letzte Nuntius in Zürich. Zürich, 1894.
- Akten über die diplomatischen Beziehungen der römischen Kurie zu der Schweiz (Quellen zur Schweizer Geschichte, Vol. XVI.). Basel, 1895.
- Bullen und Breven aus italienischen Archiven 1116-1623) (Quellen zur Schweizer Geschichte, Vol. XX.). Basel, 1902.

- Wolf, G.* Deutsche Geschichte im Zeitalter der Gegenreformation.
Vol. I., p. I. Berlin, 1888.
- Wotschke,* Geschichte der Reformation in Polen. Leipzig, 1911.
- [*Xavier, Francis, St.*] Monumenta Xaveriana ex autographis,
etc., collecta. Tomus primus, Sti Franc. Xaverii epistolas.
Matriti, 1899-1900.
- Zimmermann, A., S.J.* Maria die Katholische. Freiburg, 1890.
- Kardinal Pole. Regensburg, 1893.
- Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie.* 36 vols. Innsbruck, 1877-
1912.
- Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte,* herausg. von *Brieger.* Vols. I.
seqq. Gotha, 1877 seqq.
- Zinkeisen, J. M.* Geschichte des osmanischen Reiches in Europa.
2 vols. Gotha, 1840-1854.

TABLE OF CONTENTS OF VOLUME XIII.

CHAPTER I.

THE ELECTION OF JULIUS III.

A.D.		PAGE
1549	Importance of the pontificate of Paul III.	1
	His work for reform	2
	A distinguished conclave	3
	The attitude of Charles V. and Henry II.	3
	The interests of the Farnese and their opponent, Cardinal Salviati	4
	The question of Parma and Piacenza	5
	Parties in the conclave	6
	Wish of the Imperialists for a quick election	7
	The French delay the opening of the conclave	8
	The Cardinals go into conclave (November 29th)	8
	Arrangements for guarding the conclave, and for preserving order in the city	9
	Charles V. declares his wishes (November 20th)	10
	Opening proceedings of the conclave	11
	The first scrutiny (December 3rd)	11
	Cardinal Pole receives twenty-one votes	12
	Pole's votes increased to twenty-four	13
	The French ambassador demands that the arrival of the French Cardinals be awaited	14
	Pole's election seems assured (December 5th)	15
	Fear of a French schism	16
	Cardinal Cervini advises against delay	17
	Pole requires but one more vote	17
	Reasons for Pole's failure	18
	The candidature of Cardinal Toledo	19
	Arrival of the French Cardinals (December 12th)	19
	Second period of the conclave. Cardinal Guise	20
	Charles V. excludes several Cardinals	21
	Favourable prospects of Cardinal del Monte	22
1549	Sixty fruitless ballots	23
	Irritation in Rome	24
	Attempts at a compromise	25
	The remarks of Massarelli on December 17th	26
	The attack of Cardinal Guise on Pole	26
	Struggle between the Imperialists and the French	27

A.D.		PAGE
1550	The question of the Holy Year	28
	Implacability of the parties (January 4th)	28
	Betting in Rome on the election	28
	Unhealthy conditions in the conclave	29
	Cardinal Farnese's proposal	30
	Farnese's further proposal (January 19th). Guise's rough refusal	31
	"The Cardinals expect anything rather than an election"	31
	Speech of the Cardinal-Dean, de Cupis, on the abuses and misdeeds of the conclave (January 26th)	32
	A commission of Cardinals appointed to draw up a decree of reform	33
	The abuses in the conclave	34
	Decisions of the reform committee (January 31st)	35
	Enforcement of the enclosure; the superfluous con- clavists ejected	36
	The candidature of Salviati. Change of front of the Farnese Cardinals	37
	The candidature of del Monte is put forward	38
	It is favourably received by all parties	39
	The rival leaders agree	40
	Del Monte's election assured (February 6th)	41
	Cardinal del Monte elected by acclamation. Hom- age of the Cardinals (February 7th)	42
	The final scrutiny and end of the conclave (February 8th)	43
	Disappointment of Charles V. and Henry II. Satis- faction in the Sacred College. Joy of the Romans	44

CHAPTER II.

PREVIOUS LIFE, CHARACTER AND BEGINNING OF THE
REIGN OF JULIUS III.

	Origin of the family of the Ciochi del Monte	45
1487	Giovan Maria del Monte. His education and early career	46
1527	Governor of Rome. His narrow escape at the sack of the city	47
1536	He is created Cardinal	47
1545	Legate of Paul III. at the Council of Trent	48
1550	Personal appearance of Julius III. . . .	49
	His character and temperament	50
	The versatility of his culture. A child of the Re- naissance	51
	His lavish generosity, and popularity with the Romans	52
	Satisfaction at his conciliatory policy	53

A.D.	PAGE
1550	
His care to provide Rome with grain . . .	54
His attitude towards Charles V. and Henry II. . .	54
The Pope's instructions for the envoys to these monarchs . . .	55
Coronation of Julius III. (February 22nd) . . .	56
The Jubilee solemnly inaugurated (February 24th) . . .	56
Confraternity of the Pilgrims founded by Philip Neri . . .	57
The Pope's first consistory (February 28th) . . .	57
Reform decrees. The <i>obedientia</i> embassies . . .	58
Health of the Pope . . .	59
Efforts of Julius III. to cope with the scarcity of provisions . . .	60
Pageants in Rome . . .	61
The carnival festivities at the Vatican . . .	62
Protests of Cardinals Carafa and de Cupis against these . . .	63
Theatrical representations at the Vatican . . .	64
Promotion of the relatives of Julius III. . . .	66
Innocenzo del Monte . . .	70
He is created Cardinal. Opposition of Pole and Carafa . . .	71
Scandalous life of Cardinal Innocenzo del Monte . . .	72
He is made principal secretary of state . . .	73
The secretaries and chancery officials . . .	74
The Pope's devotion to business ; his personal direction of the diplomatic correspondence . . .	75

CHAPTER III.

PREPARATIONS FOR THE REASSEMBLING OF THE COUNCIL
IN TRENT.—THE DISPUTE CONCERNING THE DUCHY
OF PARMA.

1550	The Pope's readiness to reassemble the Council in Trent . . .	77
	Negotiations with Charles V. . . .	78
	A commission of Cardinals is appointed to deliberate on the question (April) . . .	78
	The choice of Trent approved . . .	79
	The former objections no longer applicable . . .	79
	Intrigues of the French king against the reassembling of the Council . . .	80
	Trivulzio sent to the French court, and Pighino to the Emperor . . .	81
	The instructions for Pighino . . .	81
	And those for Trivulzio . . .	83
	The Diet at Augsburg agrees to the continuance of the Council . . .	84
	The negotiations with France much more difficult . . .	85
	Unfriendly attitude of Henry II. . . .	86

A.D.		PAGE
1550	The Pope drafts the bull summoning the Council	87
	The bull approved in consistory (November 14th)	88
	The terms of the bull ; it is sent to the Emperor .	89
1551	The bull is published ; first in Germany, and then in Rome (January 1st)	90
	Secret protest of Charles V. (January 3rd)	90
	Charles V.'s " Farewell to the Diet " (February 13th)	91
	Cardinal Crescenzi is appointed Legate for the Council (March 4th)	91
	The question of Parma and Piacenza	92
	The Farnese open negotiations with France. The Pope's efforts to prevent this	93
	A <i>monitorium</i> sent to Ottavio Farnese	94
	The Pope's indignation with his vassal. Dandino is sent to the Emperor to ask his advice and help	95
	The French threaten a National Council	95
	Uncompromising attitude of Julius III.	96
	After a period of hesitation and vacillation,	97
	He decides on an appeal to arms	98

CHAPTER IV.

SECOND PERIOD OF THE COUNCIL OF TRENT.

1551	The Pope continues the preparations for the Council	99
	The presidents make their entry into Trent (April 29th)	100
	The eleventh Session of the Council is held, with a very small attendance (May 1st)	100
	Henry II. works his hardest against the Council	101
	The Pope addresses a threatening letter to the French king	102
	Schism is averted, but Henry resolves to employ force	102
	The prelates assemble very slowly at Trent	103
	Arrival of the Prince Electors of Mayence, Trêves and Cologne	104
	The twelfth Session of the Council of Trent (Sep- tember 1st)	105
	A French envoy presents a letter addressed to " the Fathers of the Convention of Trent "	106
	Henry II. refuses to be bound by the decrees of the Council	106
	Charles V. takes the opposite side	107
	The theologians of the Council prepare the canons on the Holy Eucharist	108
	The thirteenth Session of the Council of Trent (October 11th)	109

TABLE OF CONTENTS

XXXI

A.D.	PAGE
1551	Arrival of the ambassadors of the Elector of Brandenburg 110
	The Decree on the Holy Eucharist 110
	Reply of the Council to Henry II. 111
	The Decree on the Sacraments of Penance and Extreme Unction 112
	Reform decree against bad ecclesiastics 113
	The fourteenth Session of the Council of Trent (November 23rd) 113
	Decrees on the Sacrifice of the Mass and Holy Orders prepared by the theologians 114
	The conspiracy of the Elector of Saxony 114
	Representatives of the Protestant princes 115
	Their impossible demands 116
	Conciliatory attitude of the legate 117
1552	The demands of Badhorn, the Saxon ambassador, namely 118
	A reconsideration of the decrees already published 119
1552	And a " free, Christian, general " Council 120
	Dissensions between the legate and the Spanish-Imperial party 120
	Fifteenth Session of the Council of Trent (January 25th) 121
	Letter of safe-conduct for the Protestants agreed upon 121
	The Saxons still make difficulties ; the Elector Maurice playing for time 122
	The Pope rejects the Protestant demands 123
	He complains to the Emperor of the conduct of the Spaniards 124
	The Prince Electors leave Trent (March 11th) 125
	A suspension of the Council becomes inevitable 125
	The Elector Maurice throws off the mask, and, with France, attacks the Empire 126
	The decree of suspension published at the sixteenth Session of the Council of Trent (April 28th) 127
	Death of Cardinal Crescenzi 128

CHAPTER V.

WAR IN UPPER AND CENTRAL ITALY. JULIUS III.'S EFFORTS FOR PEACE. CONCLUSION OF HIS PONTIFICATE AND HIS DEATH.

1551	The Pope's efforts at the last moment to avoid war	129
	Ottavio Farnese is declared to have forfeited his fief (May 22nd)	130
	The war begun ; its unpopularity in Rome	131
	The Papal troops and their commanders ; proceedings against the Farnese	132
	Threatening movement of the Turks	133

A.D.		PAGE
1551	Unfavourable state of affairs in Upper Italy ; financial straits of the Pope	134
	The French enter Piedmont	135
	Julius III. is intimidated, and sends Cardinal Verallo to the French court	135
	The Pope's mistrust of the French king	136
1552	Cardinal Tournon sent by Henry II. to Rome	137
	The French terms of peace	138
	The Pope accepts the terms ; Charles V. unwillingly agrees	139
1552	The falseness of the accusation of indifference made against Julius III.	140
	The zeal of the Pope for the cause of peace	142
	Grave state of the Pope's health	143
	His vain attempts to reconcile Charles V. and Henry II.	143
	Siena revolts against the Spaniards, and puts itself under the protection of France (July 27th)	144
	Reaction of these events on Rome	144
	War threatened in Central Italy	145
	Julius III. takes precautionary measures	146
1553	And endeavours to arrange an armistice	147
	Dissatisfaction of Charles V.	148
	Cardinal-Legates sent to the Emperor and Henry II. (April)	149
	Failure of their mission	150
1554	Cosimo de' Medici siezes Siena ; outbreak of war (January 26)	152
	The Pope endeavours to solve the Sienese problem	153
1555	Death of Julius III. (March 23rd)	154
	Contrast between Julius III. and Julius II.	155
	Failure of the Pope to realize the gravity of the times, but	156
	His efforts for reform much underestimated	157

CHAPTER VI.

EFFORTS OF JULIUS III. FOR REFORM.—CREATION OF CARDINALS.

1550	The Pope continues the work of reform begun by his predecessor	158
	A commission of Cardinals appointed	159
1551	Reform of the Dataria, the Penitentiary and the Signatura	160
	The Pope's statutes of reform	162
1552	Regulations as to the conclave and the bestowal of benefices	163
	The Pope's comprehensive plan of reform causes a great sensation	164
	Work of the reform commission	165

A.D.		PAGE
1552	Assiduity of the Pope and the Cardinals . . .	167
1555	A general reform bull drawn up . . .	169
	Value of the reform work of Julius III. . .	170
	The question of the appointment of new Cardinals . . .	170
	Charles V.'s candidates for the purple . . .	171
1551	The first creation of Cardinals of Julius III. (November 20th) . . .	172
	The new Cardinals . . .	173
	Their political views ; the complaints of the French . . .	174
1553	Creation of four more Cardinals (December 22nd) . . .	175
	Cardinal Roberto de' Nobili . . .	176
	Francis Borgia . . .	177
1551	He flies from Rome to escape the cardinalate . . .	178
	His persistent refusal of the purple . . .	179

CHAPTER VII.

SPREAD OF THE SOCIETY OF JESUS.—THEIR REFORMING ACTIVITIES IN SPAIN, PORTUGAL, ITALY AND GERMANY.

1550	Friendly relations of Julius III. with the Society of Jesus . . .	180
	Benefits conferred on them by the Pope . . .	181
	Ignatius of Loyola draws up the constitutions of the Order . . .	182
	Completion of the life work of Loyola . . .	183
1556	His death (July 31st) . . .	184
	Spread of the Order during the life time of Ignatius . . .	184
	The Society of Jesus in Spain . . .	185
	Numerous colleges founded there . . .	186
	Their zeal for souls ; success of their labours . . .	187
	Their work for the instruction of youth . . .	188
	Opposition of the Archbishop of Toledo and the Augustinians . . .	189
	The Society of Jesus in Portugal . . .	190
	The Order has to face a crisis there ; Simon Rodriguez . . .	191
	Work of the Society in Italy . . .	192
	Ignorance in the country districts . . .	193
	Success of the missionaries . . .	193
	Appalling state of affairs in Corsica . . .	194
	Missionary labours of Fr. Landini, S.J. . . .	195
	Jesuit colleges in Italy . . .	196
	The wide-spread activities of the Society . . .	197
	The state of affairs in Germany . . .	198
	Literary activity of the Jesuits in Germany . . .	199
	Peter Canisius and the foundation of the college at Cologne . . .	200
	State of the Church in Bohemia . . .	201

A.D.		PAGE
1556	The work of Canisius in Vienna	202
	The Catechism of Canisius	203
	The desire of Ignatius to possess a college in Paris	203
	Recognition by the Parliament necessary	204
	Difficulty of obtaining this	205
	The opposition of the Bishop of Paris to the Society	206
	The Society condemned by the theological faculty	206
	Calmness of Ignatius of Loyola	207
	The difficulty settled in Rome	208
	The Society established in the Netherlands	209

CHAPTER VIII.

ACTIVITY OF THE ROMAN INQUISITION IN ITALY.—SPREAD
OF HERESY IN GERMANY, POLAND AND FRANCE.

1550	Julius III. confirms the Roman Inquisition	210
	The Inquisition in Venice	211
	The Barnabites and the Angeliche	212
	Heretical books in Italy	213
	Strict regulations concerning these	214
	Edicts against Jewish books	215
	The Pope's moderation and clemency	216
	The Cardinals of the Inquisition	217
	The Pope opposed to personal severity ; executions rare in his reign	218
	The testimony of Vergerio	219
	Heresy in Bologna, Urbino and Milan	220
	The Inquisition in Naples	221
	The Jesuits combat heresy by the instruction of the young	222
	Prelates accused of heresy	223
	The state of affairs in Germany grows steadily worse	224
	Cardinal Morone sent to Germany	225
	Reasons of the religious neglect there	226
	Proposal to found a German College in Rome	227
	Julius III. joyfully agrees to this proposal	228
1552	The foundation of the "Germanicum"	229
	Difficulty of maintaining the college	230
1551	Measures against heresy in France. The Edict of Chateaubriant (June 27th)	231
	Strained relations between Rome and Paris	232
	The spread of heresy in Poland	233
	Indifference and weakness of the Polish bishops	234
1553	Julius III.'s exhortation to the King of Poland	235
	The zeal of Bishop Hosius	236

CHAPTER IX.

ACCESSION OF QUEEN MARY OF ENGLAND.—HER MARRIAGE
TO PHILIP OF SPAIN.

1551	Fall of the Protector Somerset	237
------	--	-----

A.D.		PAGE
1552	The second Book of Common Prayer . . .	238
	Foreign theologians in England . . .	239
	The Catholic bishops deposed . . .	240
	The altars destroyed . . .	241
	All traces of Catholicism removed . . .	242
	The Thirty-nine Articles . . .	243
1553	Death of Edward VI. (July 6th) . . .	243
	Attempt to place Lady Jane Grey on the throne (July 10th) . . .	244
	Mary proclaimed queen (July 19th) . . .	244
	Mary's unhappy youth ; she steadfastly refuses to adopt the new religion . . .	245
	Her conciliatory and mild policy . . .	246
	The deposed bishops restored, and mass again celebrated . . .	247
	Joy in Rome at Mary's accession . . .	248
	Pole's letter to Julius III. . .	249
	Pole is appointed legate to England . . .	250
	His letter to the queen . . .	251
	Need of proceeding cautiously . . .	252
1553	Mary considers the presence of a legate in England impossible for the present . . .	253
	Coronation of the queen (October 1st) . . .	254
	A bill to invalidate all the religious changes is drafted, but withdrawn . . .	254
	Bills to recognize the marriage of Queen Catherine, and abolish the religious laws of Edward VI. are passed . . .	255
	Charles V. opposes the mission of Pole . . .	256
	The Pope accepts his view . . .	257
	The question of the queen's marriage . . .	258
	Candidates for Mary's hand . . .	259
	The policy and influence of Charles V. . .	260
	He proposes the Spanish marriage ; opposition in England . . .	261
1554	Mary's determination ; the marriage settlement drawn up by Gardiner . . .	262
	The rising of Sir Thomas Wyatt . . .	263
	The queen appeals to the citizens of London . . .	264
	The rebellion is crushed . . .	265
	This a turning point in Mary's reign . . .	265
	Execution of Lady Jane Grey. Parliament con- firms the marriage treaty . . .	266
	Marriage of Mary to Philip of Spain (July 25th) . . .	267
	Pole looked upon as an opponent of the marriage . . .	267
	The Pope's directions to the legate . . .	268

CHAPTER X.

LEGATION OF CARDINAL POLE.—THE RECONCILIATION OF
ENGLAND WITH THE HOLY SEE.

1554	The prospects of reconciliation . . .	270
------	---------------------------------------	-----

A.D.		PAGE
1554	Restoration of the old worship	271
	Measures against the married clergy	272
	The appointment of new bishops	273
	Meeting of Parliament and Convocation	274
	The question of Church property	275
	Pole's difficult position; he begs to be recalled	276
	His failure as a peacemaker between Charles V. and Henry II.	277
	He is repulsed by Charles V.	278
	He appeals to King Philip	279
	Pole conceals the extent of his powers from the Emperor	280
	The obstacles to his appearance in England are removed	281
	Simon Renard appears in Brussels and explains the state of affairs in England	282
	Pole at last starts for England (November 12th)	283
	His journey becomes a triumphal procession	284
	He is received by the queen at Westminster	284
	The legate's address to Parliament	285
	Solemn reconciliation of England with the Holy See (November 30th)	286
	The question of the Church property settled	287
	Thanksgiving in Rome	288

CHAPTER XI.

SPREAD OF CHRISTIANITY IN THE NEW WORLD.

New bishoprics in Spanish and Portuguese South America	290
Favourable prospects for Christianity there	291
Tyranny and atrocities of the white settlers	292
The work of the missionaries undone	293
Civilizing influence on the missionaries	294
Opposition of the colonists	295
Improvement in the conditions	296
The Franciscans in Mexico	297
Their care for the instruction of the young	298
Brother Peter of Ghent and his work	299
Conversion of the Aztecs	300
The missionaries the champions of the natives	301
Their struggle against the "Audiencia"	302
"Protectors of the Indians"	303
The Dominicans in Guatemala	304
Literary activity of the missionaries	305
Their historical and archaeological researches	306

CHAPTER XII.

THE EAST INDIES AND THE MISSION OF ST. FRANCIS XAVIER.

1554	The Jesuits in the East Indies	307
------	--	-----

A.D.		PAGE
1554	The advice of Ignatius Loyola	308
	Henriquez and the mission on the Fishing Coast	309
	He draws up the first Tamil grammar	310
	Rapacity and immorality of the Portuguese officials	311
	Persecution by the Mahommedans	312
1555	The Jesuits penetrate into Abyssinia; three Jesuit bishops appointed for that country	312
1549	Francis Xavier lands in Japan	314
	Difficulties of the Japanese mission	315
	Xavier's hopes of ultimate success; slow progress	316
1551	His journey to see the Emperor of Japan	317
	He leaves Japan in order to go to China	318
	He reaches the island of Canton	319
1552	Death of St. Francis Xavier (November 27th)	320
	Qualities of St. Francis Xavier	321
	His gentleness and humility	323
	A Protestant estimate of the saint	324
	The veneration of the Catholic world. "Apostle of the Indies"	325

CHAPTER XIII.

JULIUS III. IN RELATION TO LETTERS AND ART.—MICHAEL ANGELO AND THE REBUILDING OF ST. PETER'S.—THE VILLA GIULIA.

1552	The interest of Julius III. in science and art	326
	The Vatican Library and the Roman University	327
	Humanists promoted by Julius III.	328
	Giovio and Pietro Aretino	329
	The humanists extol the Pope; writings dedicated to him	330
	Pierluigi da Palestrina	332
	Julius III. and Michael Angelo	333
	The Pope supports him against his enemies	334
	Lack of funds for the building of St. Peter's	336
	The Pope's consideration for Michael Angelo	337
	The Villa Giulia	338
	Julius III.'s magnificent plan	339
	The architects of the Villa Giulia	340
	The Pope and Vasari	341
	The gardens and pleasure grounds	342
	The approach to the villa	343
	The main building; its frescoes and statuary	344
	Present state of the villa	345
	The fountain-court	347
	The Nymphaeum	349
	Discoveries of the relics of antiquity in Rome	350
	Reconstruction of the Palazzo Cardelli	351
	The del Monte chapel in S. Pietro in Montorio	352

A.D.		PAGE
1552	Foreign artists in Rome	353
	Artistic activity under Julius III. . . .	354

CHAPTER XIV.

ROME AT THE END OF THE RENAISSANCE PERIOD.

General appearance of the city	356
The sources for a true picture of Rome at the time	357
The sketches of Martin van Heemskerck	357
The notes of Johann Fichard	358
The panorama of Heemskerck	359
Mediaeval appearance of Rome at that time	362
Smallness of the inhabited district	362
The Borgo	364
Fichard's description of the Vatican	365
The Belvedere and its collection of antiquities	366
Old St. Peter's; the atrium	367
Interior of the old basilica	368
State of the new building in the time of Paul III. as shown by Heemskerck's sketches	369
St. Peter's Square	370
The <i>Rione di Ponte</i>	371
New streets; the Canale di Ponte and	372
The inundations of the Tiber	373
The district of banks, commercial houses and inns	374
Palaces in the Rione	375
Exterior decoration	376
The <i>Rione di Parione</i> ; the Piazza Navona	378
Pasquino	379
Palaces of prelates; the Cancelleria	381
The Palazzo Massimo, and the houses of the Galli and the Sassi	382
The Campo di Fiore; the "actual forum of Rome"	383
Shops and inns in this district	384
The <i>Rione della Regola</i>	385
Houses for pilgrims; the Palazzo Farnese	386
The <i>Trastevere</i>	388
Its picturesque charm; the old road of the pilgrims	389
The <i>Rione di S. Angelo</i>	390
The Portico of Octavia and the Theatre of Marcellus	391
The <i>Rione di Ripa</i>	392
The <i>Rione di Campitelli</i>	393
The Capitol and the Pantheon	394
The <i>Rione della Pigna</i>	395
The <i>Rione di Trevi</i> ; the Quirinal	396
Gardens and villas on the Quirinal	397
The <i>Rione di Colonna</i>	398
The <i>Rione di S. Eustachio</i>	398
Heemskerck's description of the Palazzo Madama	399

A.D.	PAGE
1552 The palaces of the Valle family . . .	399
The Valle collection of antiquities . . .	400
Other palaces in the Rione di S. Eustachio . .	401
The <i>Rione di Campo Marzo</i> ; charitable institutions	402
The Porta del Popolo and the streets leading from it	403
The whole population crowded near the Tiber .	403
Scarcity of the water supply . . .	403
The uninhabited districts of the city . . .	404
The ruins of ancient Rome . . .	405
Ruthless spoliation of the ancient monuments .	406
The Colosseum	407
Heemskerk's striking picture of the state of the Forum	407
The Palace of the Caesars	408
The Palatine and the Imperial Fora	409
A district of silence and solitude	410
The <i>Rione de' Monti</i>	410
The Lateran	411
S. Maria Maggiore	412
Witness of the inscriptions and epitaphs . .	413
The guide for pilgrims ; <i>mirabilia Romae</i> . .	414
Papal ceremonies ; Holy Week	415
Maundy thursday	416
Good Friday, Holy Saturday and Easter . .	417
The " Stations "	418
Renewed veneration for the House of God .	418
Exact carrying out of the ceremonial ; majestic music	419
Impressions of an unknown Florentine pilgrim .	420
Itinerary for a three days' visit	422
Private collections of antiquities	423
Charitable institutions ; the hospitals . . .	423
The national hospices	424
Confraternities and institutes of charity . .	425
A new impetus in Catholic life, which makes " Roma Aeterna " again	426
The " Holy City "	427

LIST OF UNPUBLISHED DOCUMENTS IN APPENDIX

	PAGE
I. Endimio Calandra to his brother Sabino . . .	431
II. Pirro Olivo to Sabino Calandra . . .	432
III. Pirro Olivo to Sabino Calandra . . .	432
IV. Benedetto Buonanni to Cosimo I., Duke of Tuscany . . .	433
V. Pope Julius III. to Cardinal Marcello Cervini . . .	433
VI. Averardo Serristori to Cosimo I., Duke of Tuscany . . .	434
VII. Consistory of March 10th, 1550 . . .	434
VIII. Averardo Serristori to Cosimo I., Duke of Tuscany . . .	435
IX. Benedetto Buonanni to Cosimo I., Duke of Tuscany . . .	435
X. Judgment of Cardinal Marcello Cervini as In- quisitor . . .	436
XI. Averardo Serristori to Cosimo I., Duke of Tuscany . . .	438
XII. Ippolito Capilupi to the Duchess of Mantua . . .	438
XIII. Ippolito Capilupi to the Duchess of Mantua . . .	439
XIV. Pope Julius III. to Paulus Jovius . . .	439
XV. Pope Julius III. to Franciscus de Augustinis . . .	440
XVI. Pope Julius III. to Cardinal Juan Alvarez de Toledo . . .	441
XVII.-XVIII. Pope Julius III. to Hannibal Spatafora . . .	445
XIX. Camillo Capilupi to Cardinal Ercole Gonzaga . . .	446
XX. C. Titio to Cosimo I., Duke of Tuscany . . .	447
XXI. Pope Julius III. to King Ferdinand . . .	447
XXIa. Averardo Serristori to Cosimo I., Duke of Tuscany . . .	447
XXIb. Cardinal Morone to Cardinal Pole . . .	448
XXII. Pope Julius III. to Petro Antonia di Capua, Archbishop of Otranto . . .	449
XXIII. Safe-conduct of Julius III.	450
XXIV. Averardo Serristori to Cosimo I., Duke of Tuscany . . .	450
XXV. Lutherans in Rome, 1552-1554 . . .	451
XXVI. Camillo Capilupi to Cardinal Ercole Gonzaga . . .	451
XXVII. Furtherance of the re-building of St. Peter's by Julius III.	452
XXVIII. Ordinances for reform by Pope Julius III. . .	457

CHAPTER I.

THE ELECTION OF JULIUS III.

PAUL III. holds a very prominent place among the Popes of the XVIth century, not only because his reign was unusually long and specially rich in events of the greatest importance, but still more because it covers the transition period between the Renaissance and the Catholic Reformation and Restoration.

A man of very great gifts, the Farnese Pope, with a full perception of the all-embracing mission of the Holy See, and of the ever-increasing gravity of the position in the northern and central countries of Europe, turned his attention in a special manner to those questions which were essentially of an ecclesiastical nature. Worldly interests, which had undoubtedly predominated during the reigns of the Renaissance Popes since Sixtus IV., also had great weight with him, but they no longer occupied the first place, and were subordinated to ecclesiastical interests.

In casting a glance over the fifteen years' pontificate of Paul III., the conviction is forced upon us that the dawn of a new era, full of hope, had arisen for the Church, in which she would again, as so often before, gloriously verify her spiritual ascendancy and her marvellous power of rejuvenation. The externally brilliant, but essentially worldly, period of the Renaissance, which took Church and religion as lightly as it did life itself, was hurrying towards its end. A new era was beginning, the most important problems of which were perfectly realized by the Farnese Pope.

However much Paul III. paid tribute to the fateful epoch at which he had come into power, he was nevertheless just to that generation in which the strictly ecclesiastical element, never losing sight of its goal, and without considering spiritual

change, was working towards a reform of conditions that were utterly corrupt, and was striving to cope with a dangerous crisis by means of an entirely new state of things. The inauguration of the Council, the removal of abuses, the renewal of the College of Cardinals, the fight against the divisions in the Church, which threatened Italy as well, and the protection of the reformed Orders, were all of epoch-making importance. A thoroughly effective result, however, had not yet been attained. The Council was as far from coming to an agreement, as the attempts at reform to completion. The new Orders were still in their initial stages, and had not, to a great extent, even fixed their final organization, while the changes in the College of Cardinals were in no way completed.

The difficulties which stood in the way of endeavours to promote the ascendancy of purely ecclesiastical interests are proved by the proceedings at the conclave after the death of Paul III.¹

¹ There is an exceedingly rich source of materials at our disposal concerning the conclave of Julius III., which, with that of Pius IV., was the longest of the XVIth century. In the first place there is the testimony of the eye-witnesses: Cardinal Bernardino Maffei, Angelo Massarelli, Sebastianus Gualterius and Petrus Paulus Gualterius (*de brevibus*), the three latter being present at the conclave as conclavists of Cardinals Cervini, Alessandro Farnese and Maffei. To these we may add the notes of the master of ceremonies of the conclave, L. Firmanus. In the second volume of the monumental publication of the Görres Society, dealing with the authorities respecting the Council of Trent, Merkle has given, in an admirable way, a full report of Massarelli, and extracts from the other four, while the editor has noted in the preface everything necessary concerning the handing down of these authorities and their relation to one another. The description made use of here is taken entirely from Massarelli, unless otherwise stated. As a complement to the whole, the reports of the ambassadors, which have been partly reprinted, have been drawn upon. Of the more recent accounts, prominence is given to SÄGMÜLLER, *Papstwahlen*, 181 *seqq.*; *Papstwahlbullen*, 1 *seqq.*; G. DE LEVA, *Storia di Carlo quinto V.*, 63 *seqq.*

Under the Farnese Pope the number of Cardinals had risen to fifty-four ; of these, twenty-nine were in the Eternal City at the death of the Pope ;¹ before the beginning of the conclave twelve more arrived,² and during the election nine Frenchmen and the Spaniard, Pacheco, also came ; three members of the Sacred College, de Givry, d'Hanebault and the Cardinal-Infante of Portugal did not take part in the conclave. Four of the Cardinals had, it is true, to leave on account of illness, so that of the fifty-four electors only forty-seven took part in the elevation of the new Pope, but in spite of this, no such distinguished conclave had taken place for a very long time. As in numbers it was the most considerable, this conclave was also the longest in the memory of man. It began on November 29th, 1549, and only finished on February 8th, 1550. The Church remained, therefore, nearly three months without a head. The cause of this unusual delay is to be found rather in the behaviour of the secular princes, who interfered in the most unjustifiable manner in electoral discussions, than in the party deliberations of the College of Cardinals, and the great number of candidates.³

That the Emperor and the King of France should, after the death of Paul III., attempt to exercise as decisive an influence as possible on the elevation of the new Pope, was to be expected. Charles V. was bound to desire a Pope who would be willing to continue the Council and recall it to Trent. He was determined to prevent at any cost the election of the eminent Marcello Cervini, who, as Cardinal-Legate at Trent, had succeeded in bringing about the removal of the Council to Bologna. The dispute about Parma and Piacenza, which was still pending, influenced the attitude of the Cardinals and the foreign powers no less than the question of the Council.

¹ Compiled by Panvinio, in MERKLE, II., 7.

² Namely Meudon on November 11, Gaddi on Nov. 14, Filonardi on Nov. 15, Madruzzo on Nov. 19, Salviati and Gonzaga on Nov. 21, Cibo and Lenoncourt on Nov. 22, del Monte and della Rovere on Nov. 23, and Truchsess and Doria on Nov. 24. See MASSARELLI, 10, 13, 14, 16, 19, 21, 22, 23.

³ Cf. the sarcasm of MUZIO (Lettere, 108).

The Viceroy of Milan and his brother, Ercole Gonzaga, Cardinal of Mantua, had displayed activity on the side of the Emperor even during the lifetime of Paul III., by bringing forward a rival to the Farnese for the future conclave who would return Parma and Piacenza to the Emperor.¹ Their chosen candidate was Cardinal Salviati, the nephew of Leo X., and uncle of the Queen of France. In the opinion of the Imperial Ambassador in Rome in 1547, Diego Hurtado de Mendoza, Salviati had, in other respects as well, the best prospects of obtaining the tiara.² He was popular both with the Cardinals who were favourable to the Imperial and the French interests, as well as with those who were neutral; Mendoza had himself been won over to his side by the Gonzagas, while Granvelle was also well disposed towards him.³ Cardinal Salviati, however, found a formidable opponent in his relative, Cosimo de' Medici, and his wily representative in Rome, Averardo Serristori. A memorandum of Cardinal Gonzaga to Granvelle, in which the candidature of Salviati was recommended, having come to Serristori's knowledge in April 1549, it was laid by him before the Pope.⁴ Paul III., who feared everything for his relatives on the part of Salviati, was extremely angry; he would create fifty Cardinals, he exclaimed, to render the election of Salviati impossible.⁵ Things did not, indeed, go as far as this, but at the nomination of Cardinals on April 8th, 1549, at which four men devoted to the Farnese interests received the purple,⁶ an answer was found to the intrigues of the Gonzagas. Salviati's correspondence was watched, and a document exposing him was com-

¹ DE LEVA, V., 64 *seq.* Legaz. di SERRISTORI, 187 *seqq.* Maffei in MERKLE, II., 19 *seq.*

² DÖLLINGER, Beiträge, I., 92. Mendoza maintains that Salviati had children; Salviati says on the other hand (Legaz. di SERRISTORI, 193) that the accusation arose from his being mistaken for his brother.

³ DE LEVA, V., 65 n. 4.

⁴ Serristori's despatch of April 13, 1549 in Legaz. 188 *seq.*

⁵ DRUFFEL, I., 270.

⁶ Cf. Vol. XII. of this work, p. 443.

municated to the Emperor,¹ whereupon Charles V. excluded him also from the election.²

Shortly before the death of Paul III., the discussions regarding the possession of Parma and Piacenza again led to a rearrangement of the parties in the College of Cardinals. As early as July 14th, 1547, the Imperial ambassador, Mendoza, had, when setting before his master the prospects for the coming Papal election,³ pointed out three politically interested parties in the Sacred College, besides a neutral group: the Imperial, the French, and the adherents of Paul III. After Alessandro Farnese had joined the side of the Emperor, however, and looked to him for the restoration of Parma and Piacenza,⁴ the Imperial party and the adherents of the Farnese joined together in the College of Cardinals. Farnese had made a move on November 19th, without having approached the Emperor in the matter, by having the authenticity of the document in which Paul III., shortly before his death, had ordered the return of Parma and Piacenza to Ottavio Farnese, attested by the Sacred College. The relations between Alessandro Farnese and the Emperor were not, however, altered by this attempt, as Camillo Orsini, the Governor of Parma, refused to deliver it to Ottavio, in spite of the College of Cardinals.⁵

There were, therefore, really only two parties to be considered in the conclave, the Imperial and the French. The Spaniards, Alvarez de Toledo, Mendoza, Cueva and Pacheco

¹ Serristori on May 1, 1549 (Legaz., 197). Maffei gives further particulars as to this compromising document, in MERKLE, II., 19 *seq.*

² "Sua Maestà vorebbe prima, che fosse Papa il Diavolo," said Mendoza to Serristori (Legaz. 209 *seq.*).

³ DÖLLINGER, Beiträge, I., 92.

⁴ Cf. Vol. XII. of this work, p. 445. Concerning the motives which induced Farnese to join the Imperialists, cf. Maffei in MERKLE, II., 26.

⁵ MASSARELLI, 16, 17. DRUFFEL, I., 316. Cf. Vol. XII. of this work, p. 450.

belonged to the Imperial party,¹ as did Carpi, Morone, Crescenzi, Madruzzo, Sfondrato, Duranti, Alessandro and Ranuccio Farnese, Medici, Maffei, Gonzaga, Doria, Sforza, Savelli, Cornaro, della Rovere, Truchsess and Pole. To these twenty-two adherents of the Emperor were opposed twenty-four Cardinals with French sympathies. These were the twelve Frenchmen, Armagnac, Meudon, Lenoncourt, du Bellay, Guise, Châtillon, Vendôme, Tournon, de la Chambre, d'Amboise, Lorraine and Bourbon. Besides these, there were of the Italians, the four Cardinal-Bishops and seniors of the Sacred College, de Cupis, Salviati, del Monte and Carafa,² as well as Cesi, Verallo, Ridolfi, Pisani, Sermoneta, Este, Capodiferro and Crispi, Filonardi also voting for the most part with them. To the neutrals belonged Cibo, Gaddi and the Portuguese, de Silva.

Cervini stood outside all these parties; Guise testifies of him, as also of Carafa, that they obeyed their conscience alone.³ This does not mean that these two champions of ecclesiastical reform took no interest in political considerations; it was precisely the conscientious and austere Cervini who was the principal adviser of Farnese.⁴ The welfare of the Church, as well as conscientious motives, required that consideration

¹ According to the enumeration of Massarelli (p. 97). Ayala (in DRUFFEL, I., 333) counts Cibo as an Imperialist; de Silva, Cervini and Rovere had also voted for Pole.

² Guise (RIBIER, II., 261) does not reckon Carafa among the French Cardinals. *Theatinus* also only appears among the adherents of the French in the list of Masius (LACOMBLET, *Archiv für Gesch. des Niederrheins*, VI., Cologne, 1868, 157.

³ RIBIER, II., 261. Cf. also with regard to Carafa the *notes of Cardinal Antonio Carafa in the Cod. X., F 55, f. 6 of the National Library, Naples.

⁴ "Farnesius, qui plurimum praesidii atque consilii in illum (Cervini) contulerat, illius ope carere (when Cervini fell ill) aegre ferebat." In order not to lose him they gave him a room adjoining the conclave, which was included in the enclosure, an unheard-of privilege. Gualterius in MERKLE, II., 60.

should be shown to those princes who could be of such use to the Church or do her so much harm.

Of the Cardinals named, Salviati, Cibo, Ridolfi, de Cupis, Pisani and Lorraine owed their elevation to Leo X., while Gonzaga, Gaddi, Doria, Tournon, de la Chambre, and Châtillon had received the red hat from Clement VII. All the others, with the exception of these twelve, had been invested with the purple by the Farnese Pope.¹

It was of importance, in the interests of the Farnese and the Imperial party, that the election should take place as soon as possible, that is to say, before the arrival of the French Cardinals,² since both parties would have an equal balance of power, should the Sacred College be assembled in full numbers, and

¹ Paul III. had given Cardinal Alessandro Farnese some very interesting hints with regard to his attitude during the Papal election, in which his attitude towards "nostre creature" is specially detailed, and Pole, Salviati Gaddi and Ridolfi are characterized in a very interesting manner. These *Ricordi di Paolo III. al card. Farnese* were already widely circulated in manuscript during the XVIth century. I discovered four copies in the Secret Archives of the Vatican; in Rome there are also copies in the Boncompagni Archives (Cod. C, 20) and in the following libraries: Barberini (Lat. 5366), S. Pietro in Vincoli (cf. LÄMMER, *Zur Kirchengesch.*, 40), Vitt. Emanuele (Varia 65); further manuscripts at Arezzo (Library), Bologna (University Library), Brescia (Quirini Library, C. III., 2), Florence (National Library, Cod. Capponi, 63), Macerata (Library, Cod. 259), Pistoia (Fabroniana Library Cod. 63), as well as at Gorkitz (Milich Library), and Munich (State Library). The *Ricordi* were published according to the Bologna manuscript by Frati in the *Archivio stor. Ital.* Ser. 5, XXXV., 448 *seqq.* Frati identifies the Cardinal of St. Angelo mentioned at the end with Lang, and concludes from this that the *Ricordi* were written between 1534 and 1540. St. Angelo, however, is Ranuccio Farnese, who had held the title of S. Angelo in Peschiera since October 7, 1546.

² * "Nella congregazione d'oggi è stato ricordato da tutti i rmi esser bene che si acceleri la elettione del Papa sotto pretesto delle cose del concilio et massimamente di quel di Trento, ma in fatto muove una gran parte di loro il disegno di escludere i

a Cardinal holding pronounced Imperial views would have no prospect of receiving the tiara. For this reason, the French ambassador in Rome, d'Urfé, tried by every means in his power to have the beginning of the conclave delayed as long as possible. He succeeded in accomplishing this through the influence of Cardinal d'Este,¹ the leader of the French party, and the solemn funeral ceremonies, celebrated with great pomp, only began on November 19th, for a Pope who had departed this life on the 10th of the same month.² The ceremonies lasted for nine days, in accordance with the usual custom, and the Cardinals could not go in procession to the conclave until November 29th, after having assisted at a solemn high mass, celebrated in the chapel of old St. Peter's, named after Sixtus IV.³

The cells for the Cardinals, formed by wooden partitions, had been erected in six of the largest halls of the Vatican, namely, the Sala Regia, the Sixtine Chapel, and in the four halls, of which two were used for the public and private consistories. Special apartments were reserved for the sick, the cells proper being divided among the Cardinals by lot on November 27th. These were hung with violet for the Cardinals of Paul III., and with green for all the others.⁴

carli Francesi, che non possino venire a tempo." Bonifazio Ruggieri to the Duke of Ferrara on November 10, 1549 (State Archives, Modena).

¹ D'Urfé to Henry II. on November 16, 1549, in RIBIER, II., 254.

² MASSARELLI, 14 *seqq.* Concerning the decision of the College of Cardinals to erect a magnificent tomb to Paul III., see Vol. XII., 453 *seq.* of this work. *

³ MASSARELLI, 26 *seqq.* As the conclave was a source of grave expense to the poorer Cardinals, 8000 ducats, provided by the Dataria, were divided among them, though not without remonstrance on the part of the stricter Cardinals, at the request of the Cardinal-Dean, de Cupis. (*ibid.*, 11). Concerning the obsequies of Paul III. *cf.* the report in the appendix to the Opera di B. SCAPPI, Venice, 1570.

⁴ MASSARELLI, 25. *Payments to the architect Baronino di Casale, who superintended the installation of the conclave, in the *Mandata 1549-1550 (State Archives, Rome).

Five thousand soldiers stood prepared to keep order in the city during the course of the election, to whom 500 other armed men were specially added for the protection of the conclave, in addition to the 200 Swiss. The Conservatori of the city had begged, "in the name of the Roman citizens," for the honour of being allowed to provide another 1000 soldiers for the safety of Rome, which number they reduced to 500 on the following day. The self-seeking and unruly Roman people wished to take up arms, and assume the guardianship of the conclave; this the Cardinals would not hear of, but they gave permission that the city should provide 500 men from the usual militia of the States of the Church.¹ Orazio Farnese, the future son-in-law of the French King, was the commander of these troops, but Mendoza having complained that Rome was delivered into the hands of the French, officers with Imperial sympathies were placed by his side.²

Fortunately, there were no serious disturbances either in Rome or outside during the long continuance of the conclave. Camillo Colonna did indeed seize several small villages immediately after the death of Paul III., and Ascanio Colonna took steps to regain possession of the sovereign authority wrested from him by the late Pope, but in other respects he assured the College of Cardinals by letter of his loyalty to the Holy See.³

On December 10th, 1549, the Cardinals were able to decide that half of this guard should be disbanded.⁴ On January 10th, 1550, this was again considerably reduced,⁵ on account

¹ MASSARELLI, 9 *seq.*

² *Ibid.* 9. D'Urfé in RIBIER, II., 255. Dandolo in BROWN, V., n. 588.

³ Cf. MASSARELLI, 9 *seq.*, 24. See also the *reports of Scip. Gabrielli of November 11, 19, 25, and 29 (State Archives, Siena) of F. Franchino of November 13, 1549 (State Archives, Parma) of Masius of November, 23, 1549 (in LACOMBLET, Archiv für Gesch. des Niederrheins, VI., 147). Cf. also Dandolo in ALBÈRI, 343 *seq.*

⁴ MASSARELLI, 54.

⁵ *Ibid.*, 90.

of the great expense, even though news had already come on December 22nd that Fermo had been invested by the Florentines.¹ On January 21st and 22nd, the conclave had again to come to a decision concerning troubles in Bologna, and the investment of Acquapendente.²

On the evening of November 30th the doors of the conclave were barred within and without by six bolts.³ The enclosure was, however, maintained with so little strictness that an eye-witness said later that the conclave had been more open than closed.⁴

Meanwhile, Charles V. had on November 20th, 1549, openly declared to his ambassador in Rome his wishes with regard to the election. He desired above all things, the election of the Dominican, Juan Alvarez de Toledo, uncle of the Duke of Alba and brother of the Viceroy of Naples; should this election, however, not be possible, he wished for Carpi, Pole, Morone or Sfondrato, who were all no less eminent than the said Spaniard. The Emperor excluded all Frenchmen, as well as Salviati, Cervini, Ridolfi, Capodiferro and Verallo.⁵

The Imperial Cardinals were not, however, aware of these wishes at the beginning of the conclave, and had decided, not for Toledo, but for Pole, although they had not yet a sufficient majority to ensure his election, but Madruzzo and others hoped that, by proclaiming Pole as Pope without further formalities, at the beginning of the conclave, they might carry with them many who were undecided. Sforza and Maffei, indeed, warned them against any such precipitate action, which would be certain to irritate the opposing party.⁶

¹ *Ibid.*, 71.

² *Ibid.*, 103.

³ *Ibid.*, 31.

⁴ "Visensis, qui iam pridem non conclusi sed patentis conclavis libertatem aegre tulerat." Gualterius in MERKLE, 90 *seq.*

⁵ MAURENBRECHER, 220. Concerning the said Cardinals *cf.* Vol. XI., 159 *seqq.*, 206; XII., 202 of this work. Concerning Sfondrato, who died on July 31, 1550, *cf.* also NOVATI in the Archivio stor. Lomb., XXI. (1894), 45 *seq.*

⁶ Maffei in MERKLE, II., 31.

The issue proved them to be right. The very fact that the beginning of the funeral celebrations for Paul III. had been so long delayed had partly been arranged to defeat this plan. When, on November 30th, the Imperial party proposed an electoral assembly for that very evening, just after the conclave had been closed, it was intimated to them that in such a grave matter, proceedings had to be carefully arranged in accordance with the usual order. The discussion which followed was only ended by night, without the Imperial party having gained any advantage.

On the two following days also, they arrived at no conclusion,¹ only the Papal election Bulls of Julius II. and Gregory X. being read over and sworn to, and an election capitulation for the new Pope prepared and accepted.² This latter agreed generally with that drawn up in the conclave of Clement VII. The last paragraph enjoined the future Pope to deliver Parma to Ottavio Farnese.

A discussion arose on the afternoon of December 1st as to whether voting should be public or secret.³ While some saw in public voting the best method of avoiding subterfuges, others considered that the freedom of voting would disappear in this way, especially at a time when the Imperial party on the one hand, and the French on the other, sought to bring voters to their views by promises and bribes, and even by threats.

On the evening of December 1st, Mendoza appeared at the door of the conclave and handed in an Imperial memorandum. A second, which he did not openly communicate, contained the wishes of Charles V. as to the election.⁴

On the morning of December 3rd, they agreed that the voting should be secret. Then followed the first ballot. On the altar there was a golden chalice and each voter advanced to it and laid his vote therein. Then the chalice was emptied

¹ MASSARELLI, 32.

² Printed by LE PLAT, IV., 156 *seq.* Cf. LULVES in the *Quellen und Forschungen des Preuss. Histor. Instituts*, XII., 224 *seq.*

³ MASSARELLI, 34.

⁴ *Ibid.*

on to a table before the altar, the three Cardinals who presided examining each vote. The senior Cardinal-Deacon, Cibo, then read aloud the name or names that were on the paper, as most of the electors wrote three or four names at the same time.¹

Cibo had to announce the name of Cardinal Pole no less than twenty-one times at this first ballot, as it had been very generally predicted that he would have the tiara, although his zeal for reform was much feared in Rome.² Toledo came next to Pole with thirteen votes, de Cupis and Sfondrato each had twelve, and Carafa ten. Salviati only had two votes, and of the Cardinals excluded by the Emperor, the highly respected Cervini was the only one who succeeded in obtaining nine votes. The wishes expressed by the Emperor do not otherwise appear to have had much influence on the voting.³ As the two-thirds majority required was twenty-eight, there

¹ *Ibid.*, 36.

² Pole, whom the above mentioned (p. 7, n. 1) *Ricordi di Paolo III.* describe as "soggetto a giudizio del mondo superiore agli altri di nobiltà, bontà e dottrina," appears as the most likely candidate in all the reports of the time immediately following the death of the Farnese Pope. Cf. the *reports of Scip. Gabrielli in the State Archives, Siena, of November 13 ("Le scommesse et le voci de la città variano ogni giorno et il più alto è Inghilterra e poi Salviati. S. Croce e ancora in buona aspettatione") 14, 15, 25, and 29 ("Il card. S. Croce quando non riesca Inghilterra si tiene in grandissima espettatione ancorche gli Imperiali publicamente mostrano poco sodisfarsene") and December 1 ("voce universale" for Pole, although his zeal for reform might rob him of the tiara; "si ragiona di Sfondrato, di S. Croce et di Monte"). Cf. also the letter of MUZIO, *Lettere*, 109 *seqq.*, and of MASIUS in LACOMBLET, *Archiv für Gesch. des Niederrheins*, VI., 146 *seqq.*; cf. also *Giorn. stor. della lett. Ital.*, XVII., 343; XLIII., 237 *seq.* On a closer examination of the state of affairs, Pole's candidature did not seem possible (see MUZIO, *Lettere*, 111-113). MASIUS is also of the same opinion on December 3 (*Briefe*, 53).

³ "Auctoritatem nullam adeptae sunt," says Maffei of Charles V.'s letter of exclusion. MERKLE, II., 51.

seemed good reason for hoping that Pole would in the following ballots easily obtain the votes still required, and that the conclave would soon come to an end.

What Pole himself felt when he found himself so near to the highest dignity on earth, he confided later to a friend.¹ The voting, he said, did not make the least impression on him. He had already given the answer to several Cardinals who urged him to take steps himself for the furtherance of his election, that he would say no word, even if his silence should cost him his life, for he adhered strictly to his principle of leaving everything to God, and desiring only the fulfilment of His Will.²

It was not customary at the first ballot of the conclave, that votes should be given to one of those chosen, after the reading of the papers, but this was allowed at subsequent ballots, and it did not seem unlikely that certain Cardinals would make use of this right in favour of Pole.³ Perhaps with the intention of putting an obstacle in the way of the zealous reformer, who was feared by the worldly Cardinals, the question was raised before the voting of the following day, whether this accession of votes to the papers already handed in by the electors, allowed later on, should be considered valid. After a long discussion, an agreement was reached by the decision that for this day also the subsequent accession should not be allowed.⁴ In spite of this, Pole's votes increased to twenty-four on this day, in the early morning of which the arrival of Cardinal Pacheco had strengthened the Imperial party.⁵

¹ To Francisco Navarrete, bishop of Badajoz, on June 17, 1550, in QUIRINI, Ep. Poli, V., 53 *seq.*; *cf.* BROWN, V., n. 671.

² Dandolo on November 30, 1549, in BROWN, V., n. 595.

³ Scip. Gabrielli *reports on December 1, 1549: Pole is very Catholic; he desires the residence of the bishops and the presence of the Cardinals in the Curia; during the lifetime of Paul III. he had said that the "offitii" must be put an end to (State Archives, Siena). *Cf.* Muzio, Lettere, 109.

⁴ MASSARELLI, 41.

⁵ *Ibid.* 42. Mendoza had sent a messenger to him to warn him as soon as possible (Legaz. di Serristori, 217). He arrived

The French, who were terrified, informed d'Urfé that the next ballot could not fail to result in favour of the Imperialists if he could not think of some way of preventing it. Then d'Urfé came to the door of the conclave and announced, through the master of ceremonies, that the French Cardinals were already in Corsica, and would soon arrive, and should the electors not wait for them till the end of the week, the French king would not acknowledge the election. In reality d'Urfé had, as he himself admitted, no news from Corsica, but in spite of this, he appeared again and repeated his protest before six of the Cardinals, threatening them at the same time with a schism.¹

A period of excitement now followed in the conclave. The consequence of d'Urfé's protest was that the Imperialists resolved not to wait till the following morning, but, that very night, without formal voting, to acclaim Pole as Pope, by a general rendering of homage.² They set about securing the necessary number of votes with the greatest zeal. As a matter of fact they had got so far that it had been already announced to Pole that the Cardinals would soon arrive in his cell and pay homage to the Head of Christendom. Those on the French side, on the other hand, did all in their power to delay this rendering of homage, and they were successful in circumventing this plan of the Imperial party. The discussions and negotiations in the corridors of the conclave lasted till far into the night, and when midnight was already passed, not one of the Cardinals had retired to his cell.³

Pole lost none of his calmness in the general excitement ; he would not hear of an elevation by the homage of the Cardinals. He caused his friends to be informed that he desired to ascend to the Supreme Pontificate through the door, but not through the window.⁴ When a deputation of two Cardinals

in the conclave " more dead than alive." Dandolo in BROWN, V., n. 596.

¹ D'Urfé to the King on December 6, 1549, in RIBIER, II., 254 *seq.* ; *cf.* MUZIO, Lettere, 116.

² MASSARELLI, 42 *seq.*

³ *Ibid.*, 43.

⁴ Dandolo in ALBÈRI, 346 ; *cf. ibid.*, 372-373.

said to him that an elevation by homage was in perfect accordance with the law, he at first agreed with them, but hardly had they taken their departure, when he sent a messenger after them to withdraw his consent.¹

The Imperialists had, however, gained one advantage during the night ; three of the Cardinals, Morone, Cesi and Gaddi, declared that they were prepared to support the election of Pole next morning, by giving him their votes by way of accession, whereupon the Imperialists believed that they could await the coming ballot with joyful anticipation. They never dreamed that these three supplementary voters would inform the French party that they would only come to the assistance of Pole when he had twenty-six votes.²

On December 5th it was generally expected as certain that Pole would receive the necessary majority of two-thirds at the voting. Before the Cardinals proceeded to the scrutiny, nearly all of them had ordered their cells to be emptied, as they did not wish to be plundered by the rush of people after the election. The Papal vestments had already been laid out for Pole, and he had himself composed an address of thanks which he had shown to several persons. Outside, in front of the Vatican, the people assembled in great crowds, while the troops were standing with flying colours, ready to salute the new Pope.³

Meanwhile the French party in the conclave had no idea of giving in without a fight. In the early morning attempts began again on both sides to influence one or another in favour of each of the conflicting parties. The excitement and irritation became visibly more acute. When the hour for the Mass, which was to precede the voting, arrived, the master of ceremonies was forbidden to give the usual signal with the bell ; he was to wait till all the Cardinals were together. It seemed

¹ Pole to the bishop of Badajoz on June 17, 1550, *loc. cit.* (see *supra* p. 13, n. 1).

² Massarelli and Gualterius in MERKLE, II., 42 *seq.*

³ Maffei in MERKLE, II., 43. Appendix to Massarelli by Panvinio, *ibid.*, 47.

as if a sort of schism was being prepared. The adherents of Pole assembled in the Pauline Chapel, his opponents in the Sistine. Voting was not for the moment to be thought of.

Meanwhile, Cervini, who on account of his invalid condition, was in the habit of arriving later, appeared in the Pauline Chapel. Carpi, Morone, Madruzzo, Gonzaga and Farnese advanced towards him, and, explaining the state of affairs, begged him to approach the opposing party as mediator. Cervini allowed himself to be persuaded and went in Morone's company to the Sistine Chapel. He then addressed himself to the Cardinal Dean, de Cupis. The opponents of Pole, he said, had already sinned enough against their consciences, by using every means in their power to prevent his election, but as it was now clear that the Holy Ghost wished Pole to be elected, he begged them not to continue their resistance.

De Cupis thereupon answered that he also wished for peace and unity, but that a Papal election seldom took place without differences of opinion, and that their opponents had made use of unlawful measures, while the protest of d'Urfé had given reason to fear a French schism.

Thereupon the answer was made that the remarks about intrigue were not all founded on fact, and that if attention were paid to every protest, they would establish a very bad precedent, and the minority would, in the future, when a candidate did not please them, protest until they had gained their end. Moreover, they could not wait any longer for the French Cardinals, as the lawful time had long been passed.

These and similar reasons were, however, of no avail, and the messengers returned to Pole's adherents without having gained any advantage. Finally, two hours after the usual time, the French party consented to join the other Cardinals, at least for a conference.

De Cupis began the negotiations by again urging them to wait for the French Cardinals; the Papal election decree of Gregory X. was, he said, no impediment to their doing so, as, although it prescribed only a ten days' period of waiting, it had not foreseen the present position. A long debate followed upon this statement of de Cupis. Salviati, Carafa, Lenon-

court and Meudon agreed with de Cupis, Carpi and Toledo differed from him, while del Monte thought that if they were allowed to wait, they might as well do so. Filonardi was undecided. Then Cervini again spoke and emphasized in impressive terms the danger of giving way before the protest. From a legal standpoint they could only wait for the French Cardinals if all present agreed to do so.

Cervini was known as a man who only spoke after the dictates of his own conscience, and not to please either party. His words made such an impression that the Cardinals who spoke after him all agreed with him, those belonging to the French party alone excepted. Este by a panegyric on the services France had rendered to the church still endeavoured to obtain a delay of one or two days, but Sfondrato arose and showed that according to the text of the decree of Gregory X., they dared not delay the election any longer. It was not the case, as de Cupis had asserted, that the decree did not apply to the case now in question ; on the contrary, it was quite clear that it did refer to the present position.

The French cause now seemed lost. At the voting concerning the proposal of the Cardinal-Dean, the majority declared themselves against any further delay, and they at once proceeded to hold the election. Pole received twenty-three votes. Then Carpi arose, opened his voting paper, and declared that he joined the supporters of Pole. Farnese then stood up and made the same declaration. A dead silence followed. Pole required only one more vote. If he could now obtain twenty-six votes, he was sure of getting twenty-seven, after the agreement during the night, and then he could give the twenty-eighth, the last vote necessary, himself. Full of expectation, Pole's supporters watched his opponents, and endeavoured by signs to win them over to his support. No one, however, made a movement. After a pause the Cardinal-Dean asked if anyone would still come over to Pole's side, but only a deep silence followed. Thereupon de Cupis declared the voting over, and all stood up and withdrew, the Imperialists in great depression of spirits.

No one had expected such an issue. Many considered it

could only be possible through a special interposition of Providence, that any Cardinal should have been so near the tiara as Pole had been, and still not have received it.

The reasons for Pole's failure lay principally in the repugnance of the Italians to the choice of a foreigner. Besides this it was urged that Pole was only forty-five years old, that he had little knowledge of business, and that there was a danger of his involving Italy in a war with England. What injured him, however, more than anything else was the suspicion that he inclined in his views, especially in the doctrine of Justification, to Protestantism. It was Carafa in particular who laid stress on this point, and openly attacked Pole before the voting of December 5th.¹

The five following ballots, from December 6th to 11th, are not of great importance. D'Urfé appeared at the door of the conclave on December 6th, and again announced the early arrival of the French Cardinals.² The Imperialists made repeated attempts to secure Pole's election. All the Cardinals of the Imperial party, he himself naturally excepted, and de Silva, voted for the English Cardinal. Filonardi, Cibo, Gaddi and the Cardinals belonging to the French party, as far as they were present in Rome,³ were opposed to him. On the morning of December 7th, it was again generally believed that Pole's friends had nearly attained their object, but the other party had not in the meantime been idle. Pole received on that morning only two supplementary votes, besides the twenty-two that he was sure of day after day. They had brought forward, between the ballots of December 6th and 7th, as an opposing candidate, Toledo, whose election was so greatly desired by the Emperor and the Duke of Florence; so many Cardinals on both sides promised him their votes that his election seemed certain. Toledo's candidature was, however,

¹ Appendix to Massarelli by Panvinio, in MERKLE, II., 47. Maffei and Gualterius, *ibid.* 43, 47. Mendoza in DRUFFEL, I., 306. See also MUZIO, Lettere, 114, 117.

² "Qui eandem supradictam cantilenam recantavit et discessit." Firmanus in MERKLE, II., 49.

³ MASSARELLI, 55.

nothing more than an election manœuvre. The French declared themselves for him in order to destroy the unity of the Imperial party, and to deprive the English Cardinal of his vote. They also raised hopes of the tiara in other Cardinals, but only with the intention of winning them away from Pole. The Imperialists now apparently favoured Toledo's candidature, in order to force the French party to an acknowledgment of their insincerity, so that his election seemed certain. The French, however, then at once abandoned him.¹

Their success in the struggle against Pole now encouraged the French party to attempt the candidature of Salviati. In the opinion of Cardinal Maffei,² they would have succeeded if they had proceeded more quickly, but Salviati's old friend, Gonzaga, thought it necessary first to obtain the opinion of the Emperor, from whom, however, a letter was received by Ferrante Gonzaga, containing a sharp reprimand.

On December 12th the French Cardinals, du Bellay, Guise, Châtillon and Vendôme, whose coming was announced by d'Urfé on December 10th, at last arrived in Rome, and betook themselves, after a short rest at the French embassy, to the conclave. This strengthening of the opposing party was a serious blow to the Imperialists. They had again tried to put Toledo in the place of Pole at the voting on December 12th, and this time perhaps in earnest, but at the news of the arrival of the French Cardinals, they again returned to Pole. Toledo only succeeded in getting twelve votes and three supplementary ones. On the evening of December 12th Cardinal Tournon was also present, but his appearance was no advantage to the French party, as Filonardi, whose sympathies were French, had to leave the conclave on the 14th, on account of illness, and he died on the 19th.³

¹ According to Maffei in MERKLE, II., 49. According to Massarelli (*ibid.*) they had again withdrawn from Toledo because the Italians and French wished for a Spaniard as little as they wished for an Englishman. Cf. MUZIO, Lettere, 119.

² In MERKLE, II., 51.

³ Cf. MUZIO, Lettere, 123.

A new period began for the conclave with the appearance of the French Cardinals. The number of voters had now risen to forty-six, so that the two-thirds majority was now thirty-one. The number, however, sank to forty-five, as Cervini had to leave the conclave on account of illness on December 22nd, but again rose to forty-seven on the arrival of Cardinals de la Chambre and d'Amboise on the 28th. The entry of John of Lorraine into the conclave on December 31st had no influence on the relative strength of the parties, as de la Chambre had to seek treatment for stone outside the Vatican on the following day. In the same way Bourbon's arrival on January 14th was counterbalanced for the French party by the loss of Ridolfi, whose sympathies were French. He was seriously ill, and left the conclave on December 20th, and died on the 31st. Cibo, who was also ill, was temporarily absent from the conclave, from January 23rd to February 1st.¹

From December 12th, the leader of the French party was the twenty-three year old Cardinal Guise, the confidant of his king. He was an adroit and self-confident politician, and the candidate whom he wished to support was the old Cardinal of Lorraine. Should this not prove practicable, then Este, and after him Ridolfi, Salviati and finally Cervini or del Monte were each in turn to be put forward.² Henry II. had already, on December 3rd, caused his ambassador to be informed by letter that he did not wish for Pole.³

As Lorraine was excluded by the Emperor as a Frenchman,

¹ Cibo hoped to become Pope with the help of the Duke of Florence (see STAFFETTI, Card. Cibo, Florence, 1894, 249). A biting lampoon (published by CIAN in the *Giorn. stor. della lett. Ital.*, XVII., 341) chastised his ambition. Cf. also STAFFETTI in the *Atti d. Soc. Ligure*, XXXVII. (1910), 351 *seqq.*

² Henry II. to Guise on January 25, 1550; d'Urfé to Henry II. on January 20, 1550 (RIBIER, II., 259-262. DE LEVA, V., 78). A letter of the French King, in which he designated de Cupis, Salviati, Ridolfi and Lorraine as candidates above all others, was already known in the conclave on January 6. MASARELLI, 85.

³ RIBIER, II., 258.

and he had also excluded Ridolfi, Salviati, Cervini, Capodiferro and Verallo by name, which he repeated by letter on December 19th,¹ the complaint of Maffei can be understood when he says that all the more important Cardinals had been barred, either by Charles V. or Henry II., and that persons who were quite unqualified were entertaining hopes of the tiara.²

On December 30th Charles V. excluded Cardinal Carafa, in addition to the five already named ;³ the Imperial Ambassador was instructed to proceed in a similar manner against de Cupis and del Monte, but only to mention them in case of need, so as not needlessly to make enemies of those referred to.⁴ Mendoza kept these instructions secret for the time being, in order that he might be able to make another unwelcome candidate impossible, by apparently supporting one of those excluded. In this manner he promoted, at least in appearance, the election of Salviati,⁵ but when complaints were made to the Emperor concerning him by the other diplomatists, he was sharply reprimanded by his master.⁶ Those who understood the circumstances had soon foreseen how matters would develop in this state of affairs. Buonanni, the conclavist of Cardinal Toledo, wrote on November 27th, 1549, even before the beginning of the election proceedings, that should the conclave only last from four to six days, it was the general belief that either Pole or Toledo would be successful ; should the negotiations, however, be drawn out, and the French Cardinals arrive, he was of opinion that they would put difficulties in the way

¹ DRUFFEL, I., 336. The letter arrived in Rome on December 29. It was the answer to an announcement from the conclave of December 8, which had been received in Brussels on the 18. Dandolo in BROWN, V., n. 613. Gualterius in MERKLE, II., 78, 79.

² Maffei in MERKLE, II., 63.

³ DRUFFEL, I., 338.

⁴ MAURENBRECHER, 222, n. 9.

⁵ DE LEVA, V., 79.

⁶ *Ibid.*, 86. MAURENBRECHER, 223 n. 10. Gualterius in MERKLE, II., 78, 85. PETRUCCELLI, II., 43, 45.

of Salviati's election, but that favourable prospects would open out for del Monte, and if the Imperial party should support him, he might easily reach the Papal throne, while his elevation would give satisfaction to all parties.¹ Serristori, however, who drew his information chiefly from Buonanni,² wrote to the Duke of Florence after the arrival of the French Cardinals, that the Imperial and French parties were henceforth equally balanced, and that two things alone were possible, either that the one party should exhaust the patience of the other by repeated ballots, or that they should agree upon a Pope who would give least dissatisfaction to both parties. His opinion was that del Monte might be one of those for whom the French party would co-operate, and who would be least displeasing to the Emperor, for although del Monte had agreed to the removal of the Council, he had only done so in obedience to the Pope, while in other respects he had never had French sympathies and did not wish to belong to the French party, but to the Imperialists.³ In the conclave itself, however, nobody at that time thought seriously of del Monte, although Guise had nominated him among others as a candidate. Cardinal Sforza, however, was quite positive even then that the Cardinals would unite in choosing him.⁴ Guise also wrote towards the end of the year, that del Monte or Cervini might be Pope the next day if the French desired it, but that to please the King they would first try all the others, and

¹ * "Se i [n] 4 o 6 giorni del conclavi si facesse Papa, credano che o Inghilterra o Burgos per riuscire. . . . In caso che la detta promotione vada a lungo, penso che con li obstaculi che hara Salviati, si farà gran giuoco a Monte, il quale se fusse abbracciato secretamente dagl'Imperiali con quelle sorte d'obligationi . . . anderebbe a quella sede con pochissimi obstaculi et satisfarebbe universalmente la sua elettione." Buonanni to Christiano Pagni, Rome, November 27, 1549 (State Archives, Florence). Cf. PETRUCELLI, II., 34 *seqq.*

² PETRUCELLI, II., 26.

³ Legaz. di Serristori, 222.

⁴ Maffei in MERKLE, II., 59.

would wait patiently as long as these had any chance.¹ On the other hand the Imperialists determined to keep steadily to Pole. They assembled at once after the arrival of the French Cardinals, in the presence of Cardinal Madruzzo, and formally pledged themselves in favour of Pole.² Their resolve may have partly arisen from a sort of obstinacy, which persisted in clinging to a lost cause. One can, however, also trace the influence of the reform party in this, ready to risk everything to secure a Pope of their own way of thinking. "We want a good and holy Pope," said Truchsess on January 20th, when a heated discussion arose between him and de Cupis, "but you will only have one who serves the body and not the soul; we will have no Pope elected who will neglect God's Church in order to enrich his relatives, as was the case with the last four or five."³

Under these circumstances there was no possibility of a speedy termination of the conclave. Following on the last eight fruitless ballots there now came fifty-two equally without result, in which there never was any other intention than a mere prolongation of the time, whether with a view to receiving further instructions with regard to the election from the secular princes, or with the intention of working privately for a certain candidate.⁴ Above all, however, the decision was postponed so that the opposing parties, disgusted by the endless intrigues, might at last unite in a less agreeable choice. At these fifty-two ballots, therefore, Pole received twenty-three votes every time, until January 9th, and, from that time, after the loss of de Silva and Cibo, always twenty-one. The French had nominated Carafa as the opposing candidate, not, however, because they wished him to be Pope,⁵ but because they wished to drive the austere and zealous Pole

¹ Guise to Henry II. on December 28, 1549 (or, according to DE LEVA, V., 81, on January 2, 1550) in RIBIER, II., 260.

² Gualterius in MERKLE, II., 57.

³ MASSARELLI, 69.

⁴ RIBIER, II., 268.

⁵ DE LEVA, V., 81 n.

out of the field by nominating an opponent of the same way of thinking.¹ From December 15th to the end of the conclave, from twenty-one to twenty-two votes were generally given to the Neapolitan Cardinal.

In the meantime the Papal exchequer was being drained for the payment of the military guard on duty,² the irritated populace stormed perpetually in front of the Vatican and shouted for a new Pope, while monks and clergy were daily holding processions.³ The Lutherans in Germany jeered at the disunion in the Roman Church,⁴ while the universal vexation in Rome vented itself in innumerable satirical poems about the Cardinals and their slavish adulation of the secular princes.⁵

Without giving up either Pole or Carafa, they tried many other candidates in the conclave, working as a rule, however, privately for these, and only openly nominating them when

¹ Dandolo on December 18, 1549: "Francesi . . . con dire: opponamus sanctum sancto ne diedero 22 a Chieti." DE LEVA, V., 81.

² MASSARELLI, 131.

³ *Ibid.*, 59.

⁴ Charles V. is supposed to have said: "Pour un Lutherien qu'il avait auparavant la vacation du Papat, il y en a maintenant quantité" (letter of Henry II. to Guise of February 6, 1550, in RIBIER, II., 263). The voting papers came back from Germany after 15-20 days with marginal notes. Ayala to Mendoza on December 17, 1549, in DRUFFEL, I., 328.

⁵ See MASSARELLI, 85. With regard to the plentiful lampoon literature of the conclave of Julius III., see, besides the admirable essays of CIAN in the *Giorn. stor. della lett. Ital.*, XVII., 337-353, and *ibid.*, XLIII., 232 *seqq.*, the unpublished sarcastic poems on the conclave in the Cod. Palat. 1913, of the Vatican Library. The remark of Giulio Gentile in a *letter to the grand chancellor of Milan, dated Rome, January 5, 1550 (State Archives, Milan), that he would send the *pasquini*, although they were "assai ignobili, scortesi et sporchi," confirms, among other publications of this nature, the *Pasquinatella in the Venetian dialect, which Giuseppe Inglesco sent to Mantua with a letter of January 28, 1550 (Gonzaga Archives, Mantua).

they were sure of a certain number of votes. In the reports of the scrutinies, therefore, no mention is made of several candidates.

From time to time various proposals were made as to how the Papal election might be secured in a manner differing from the usual procedure. The first of these proposals was made as early as December 14th, even before the French had nominated a candidate of their own. Both parties assembled separately on this day, one in the Sixtine and the other in the Pauline Chapel, and communicated with each other through intermediaries. The French proposed a choice between nine candidates : three of their own countrymen, Lorraine, Tournon and du Bellay, three Italians of French sympathies, Salviati, Ridolfi and de Cupis, and three neutral Italians, Carafa, del Monte and Cervini. The Imperialists replied that they would only have Pole.¹ On this refusal the wearisome round of fruitless ballots began over again.

It was, however, beginning to occur to the Imperialists that it was impolitic to cling so obstinately to Pole. They therefore assembled late in the evening on December 16th, and sent Truchsess, Pacheco and Farnese as intermediaries to the French, to propose Carpi and Toledo as candidates instead of Pole. This offer was refused, as was expected.² The Imperialists had already thought of working for Sfondrato, and of favouring Morone at the ballots, so that their real aim might remain secret. "For many days," said Maffei,³ "nothing further happened than that they made new proposals to one another, more with a view to prolonging the time than of reaching a decision."

It was then that the Imperial Cardinals, merely on account of the honour, gave fifteen votes to the Cardinal-Infante of Portugal, whereupon the French, on the following day, outdid them by giving eighteen votes and two supplementary ones to Guise, also merely for the sake of the honour. "Behold,

¹ MASSARELLI, 58 *seq.*

² *Ibid.*, 62.

³ MERKLE, II., 59.

reader," remarks Massarelli on December 17th,¹ "at what times we have arrived! After we have vainly employed twenty days in electing a Pope, and the whole of Christendom is daily clamouring for one, behold the zeal which the Cardinals display for the common weal, by bestowing twenty votes at this day's scrutiny on a young man of twenty-three, not with the intention, as they themselves acknowledge, of making him Pope, but out of consideration for his rank and the favour which he enjoys from the King. It is the truth that in these days persons are elevated to the high rank of Cardinal who seek to please man rather than God, for, as God knows, when certain Cardinals, worthy in every respect of being candidates for the Papal throne, were proposed, the answer was that this election would not please the Emperor, or from the French, that their King would not approve of him as Pope."

On December 19th the prelates and barons who were entrusted with the guarding of the conclave joined the populace in demanding a speedy election. They represented that troubles which only a Pope could allay were arising in all directions; the mercenaries were getting bolder every day, the streets were no longer safe, while the cost of the vacancy in the Holy See was no longer to be borne. Within the conclave vexation was also making itself felt. The drastic proposal was even made that the two leaders, Guise and Farnese, should be shut in together, without food, till they should agree upon a Pope.³ On December 17th the youthful Guise had considered it seemly to make remonstrances to Pole, before all the Cardinals and conclavists, who were awaiting the issue of the affair in a state of the greatest tension. He accused

¹ *Ibid.*, 64 *seq.*

² MASSARELLI, 67.

³ Gualterius in MERKLE, II., 67. Other proposals are to be found there and in Paulus de Brevibus, *ibid.*, 66. On January 7, nearly all the Cardinals were together after dinner in a corridor of the conclave, and when several of them said, as a joke, that it would be a good thing if the doors were now closed, and the Cardinals thus forced to make a choice, the conclavists really shut them in for three hours. *Ibid.*, 86.

Pole of not possessing the qualities necessary for the Head of the Church, and said that his sudden withdrawal from the Council of Trent had given rise to the suspicion that he did not agree to the decree on Justification, and advised him therefore to withdraw his candidature. The Cardinal attacked answered calmly that his withdrawal from the Council was occasioned solely by reasons of health, and that although he would take no steps to be chosen Pope, he would also not prevent the Cardinals from bestowing their votes upon him if they were inclined to do so.¹

Pole's candidature, however, proved in the meantime more than hopeless, and the Imperialists could no longer shut their eyes to the fact. After they had been terrified, on December 26th, by the news that three more French Cardinals would soon arrive, they risked everything to have Toledo elected, if possible, on the following day. They actually succeeded, quite privately, in adding another eight votes to the twenty-three which they already possessed, so that Toledo's election seemed assured. In spite of their secrecy, however, the plan became known, and the French, who had nominated de Cupis as the opposing candidate, succeeded, by dint of hard work during the night, in winning back these eight votes from the Imperialists. On December 27th Toledo had only twenty votes, de Cupis twenty-one and one supplementary one. The Imperialists had, therefore, to resign themselves to the strengthening of the French party on December 28th by the arrival of de la Chambre and d'Amboise.

In the meantime a new difficulty had arisen. The Jubilee Year of 1550 was to be inaugurated by the opening of the

¹ Gualterius in MERKLE, II., 64. A similar scene took place on March 22. When Pole again received 23 votes and Carafa 20 in the ballot on that day, Carafa stood up and begged the Cardinals not to consider his candidature. Pole also stood up and repeated his former declaration. If anyone gave him his vote merely from motives of friendship, he begged him to refrain from so doing; should he, however, be obeying the dictates of his conscience, he could not, and would not, bring any pressure to bear on him. MASSARELLI, 70 *seq.*

Golden Door on Christmas Eve. Many pilgrims had already arrived in Rome. It was, however, doubtful if the Holy Year, with its usual indulgences and faculties for absolution, could be inaugurated without a Pope, and without the ceremonies mentioned. The prelates and barons, therefore, applied to the Cardinals, complaining at the same time of the long delay and want of unity in the conclave. The barons said that the guarding of the doors of the conclave should be entrusted to them, as the prelates were too indulgent for such a duty. The Dean, de Cupis, informed the Cardinals of these difficulties on December 29th. No remedies could as yet be found for the disagreement in the conclave, which no one denied, but with regard to the Jubilee, a declaration was issued on the following day that it had undoubtedly begun, and that the opening of the Golden Door would be performed subsequently by the future Pope.

At that time, however, there seemed but little hope of soon getting the future Pope. The Imperialists, as the Venetian ambassador, Dandolo, wrote on December 21st, 1549, had pledged their word in writing not to give way to their opponents, and he reported on January 8th, 1550, that both parties had pledged themselves by oath not to yield to the other.¹ On December 26th they wrote from the conclave that the French were then boasting that they were as well off in the conclave as if they were in paradise, and that they would hold out until everyone was exhausted. The opposing party spoke to the same effect ; neither the length of time nor any other consideration should rob Cardinal Pole of one of his votes, or force another candidate upon them.² This implacability of the parties, we are informed by another report of January 4th, 1550, arose from the fact that one party awaited the Holy Ghost from Flanders, and the other from France. People in Rome betted 40 to 1 that there would be no Pope in January, and 10 to 1 that there would also be none in the following

¹ BROWN, V., n. 602, 618.

² *Ibid.*, 2. 606.

month.¹ Similar bets are repeatedly mentioned.² A retainer of Cardinal Gonzaga writes on January 4th³ that people in the city were speaking of anything rather than of the Papal election. Another correspondent sees a possibility of the hastening of the election in the unhealthy conditions of the conclave, as the air is charged to such an extent with the fumes of candles and torches that many have serious fears for their health.⁴

¹*“Stanno anchora in conclave questi reverendissimi signori, ne pare che vi sii una speranza al mondo di Papa. Sono divisi in due parti et stanno la dentro ostinati, aspettando l’una il Spirito santo di Fiandra et l’altra di Francia, che Dio sa quando saranno d’accordo, nè può fare il Papa l’una parte senza l’altra, se non si rumpano. Si da quaranta per cento che non si farà per tutto questo mese et dieci per l’altro.” Pietro Maria Carissimo to Sabino Calandra on January 4, 1550 (Gonzaga Archives, Mantua). Mendoza took the liberty of making a joke about the Cardinals by wishing them a happy Easter instead of a happy Christmas. Gaulterius in MERKLE, II., 74.

²BROWN, V., n. 621 (January 11), n. 627 (January 15), n. 629 (January 18), n. 630 (January 22).

³*“La cosa é di maniera posta in silentio che d’ogni altra cosa si ragiona qui che di questa.” Giuseppe Inglesco to Sabino Calandra, segretario ducale (Gonzaga Archives, Mantua).

⁴*Non s’ha una minima fermeza di dover haver un Papa di qui a quindici di et di conclavi si sono havuto polize et qui in casa nostra et altrove che promettono che presto presto sara fatto un Papa, et acenano a Salviati, mostrando che quei s^{ri} reverendissimi sieno sforzati a risolversene se non per altro almeno per non ammorbari in quel conclavi, dove dicono che è tanto fumo delli candeli et torchi che vi se tengono accese, ét tanto polvere et tanta puzza delli cantari orinali et tinello che vi si fa di continuo, che poco poco più che duri quella festa dubitano da vero di ammorbarvisi.” Giuseppe Inglesco to Sabino Calandra, segretario ducale et castellano di Mantova, December 31, 1549 (Gonzaga Archives, Mantua). Cf. Dandolo on January 22, 1550, in BROWN, V., n. 630. The smell from the lavatories was often mentioned. Firmanus, in MERKLE, II., 88, 96.

A feeble attempt was made to come to a decision on January 2nd, 1550. Guise and Farnese agreed to a meeting, at which the former finally offered Cardinals de Cupis, Salviati, Ridolfi, Lorraine, Este and Capodiferro as candidates. Farnese answered that he would make a generous proposal: either Guise might choose a candidate from the twenty-three adherents of Pole, or allow that he, Farnese, might choose one of the twenty-two voting for Carafa, to be raised to the Papal throne. Neither of these proposals was accepted.¹ The ballots which now followed are the less worthy of note as the French had decided only to put forward their real candidate when Cardinal Bourbon had arrived from France.²

This Cardinal entered the conclave on January 14th. It appeared, however, to be still impossible to secure the full number of votes necessary for the three principal French candidates, Lorraine, Ridolfi or Salviati. In consequence of this, Salviati refused at first to come forward as a candidate, and the two others did likewise.³ The Imperialists had been at

¹ MASSARELLI, 82. Cf. the *report of Giulio Gentile to the grand chancellor of Milan, dated Rome, January 5, 1550 (State Archives, Milan).

² Dandolo in BROWN, V., n. 618.

³ As Farnese is reported to have said to Marshall de la Mark, after the elevation of Julius III., Ridolfi and Salviati (as well as de Cupis) had been put forward as candidates in appearance only, for the sake of gaining time, in order that they might in the meantime canvass for Este, and secure for him the approval of the Emperor. This had been the only reason for the long duration of the conclave. Cardinal d'Este is said to have offered Parma to Ottavio Farnese, the archbishopric of Narbonne and the favour of the French king to Alessandro, and a daughter of the Duke of Ferrara and 200,000 livres to Orazio, in order to win the support of Cardinal Farnese (RIBIER, II., 268). The readiness of the princes to support their candidates by the expenditure of large sums is also referred to by PETRUCELLI, II., 33, 42, 43. Concerning French attempts at bribery cf. *ibid.*, 46 *seq.* Guise received in Lyons a bill of exchange for large sums to be collected in Rome. RIBIER, II., 257: cf. SÄGMÜLLER, Papstwahlen, 184 n. 2; DRUFFEL, I., 321 *seq.*, 325, 328.

the same time working very actively for Morone, who received twenty-four votes, and two supplementary ones on January 15th, and they only lost hope when the French again got two votes away from him, whereupon, despairing of his success, they once more returned to Pole.

In the general bewilderment of those days, Farnese endeavoured to advance a step further on January 19th by designating clearly and decisively to their opponents those candidates for whom the Imperialists would, in no case, vote. These were de Cupis, Carafa, Salviati and Ridolfi, as they had been excluded by Charles V., and quite apart from the fact that they were enemies of the Emperor, it was to be feared that their election would irritate him and plunge Italy into war.¹ He begged them at least to relinquish the election of these Cardinals. Guise's reply was a rough refusal. The next development was that he refused to act at all with Farnese, as the latter had promised him to vote for Lorraine, and had broken his word, which was unworthy of a gentleman. If, however, the Imperialists thought it right to exclude such worthy men from the Papacy, he declared, on his part, that the French would never, in all eternity, vote for Pole, Morone, Sfondrato or Carpi.

Thus this attempt at conciliation ended by widening the differences between the contending parties.² Conclavists who left the place of voting on January 28th and 29th, unanimously declared that the Cardinals expected anything rather than the election of a Pope.³

In the second half of January they began at length to reflect on the causes of the continued delay and to seek for a remedy. The Cardinal-Dean, de Cupis, made a speech to this effect after the voting of January 16th, and specially denounced the

¹ "Si enim illi aperti Caesaris hostes ad pontificatum eveherentur Caesarem protinus ad arma concitarent totamque perniciosissimo bello Italiam ince[n]derent." (Gualterius in MERKLE, II., 100). This reason was, however, of no weight as far as Carafa was concerned.

² MASSARELLI, 100.

³ Dandolo in BROWN, V., n. 635. Cf. MUZIO, Lettere, 142, 146.

decision according to the terms of which a Cardinal could only announce his adherence to the election of a candidate with the concurrence of the members of his party.¹ Carafa agreed with de Cupis, and read the decree of Gregory X. with regard to the Papal election. Pacheco acknowledged that both sides had been to blame, but especially the French, as, while thwarting Pole's election, they had limited for their adherents, by means of the promise given under oath, both their freedom of voting and of joining the other party.²

On January 26th a general congregation of the Cardinals was held instead of the scrutiny, which would again have been without result, and de Cupis once more spoke of the abuses and misdeeds of the conclave. The intrigues and secret manœuvres, he said, were more calculated to prolong than to conclude the election, when one side merely endeavoured to circumvent the other, and this had assumed such proportions that an election was out of the question. The consideration shown to the secular princes, according to whose instructions votes should be given to one candidate and withheld from another, was specially to be deplored, as it was against the dictates of conscience and was a disgrace to the College of Cardinals. Voting was no longer free and a change was urgently needed. A further abuse lay in the neglect of the observance of the enclosure, and in the enormous number of conclavists, among whom many persons crept in, who did not belong to the conclave. Most abominable of all, however, was the custom by which both parties, even before the voting, announced to whom their votes would be given, a practice which meant that no Cardinal could vote without having previously informed the other members of his party and received their consent.³

This speech of the Dean was favourably received by the

¹ Cf. DRUFFEL, I., 331 *seq.*

² MASSARELLI, 95 *seq.* According to Gualterius (MERKLE, II., 87) the French took an oath never to write Pole's name on a voting paper. Cf. DRUFFEL, I., 314.

³ MASSARELLI, 107; cf. Gualterius in MERKLE, II., 87.

Cardinals. Salviati complained of the excessive complaisance towards the princes, Carafa adding that if matters continued like this, it would end in the secular princes electing a Pope without the Cardinals, which would, as far as he was concerned, be more agreeable than this perpetual dilatoriness. Pacheco emphasised the danger of the Council claiming the right to elect the Pope.¹ Sfondrato and Guise, indeed, pointed out the difficulties attending a reform, but the others unanimously resolved to choose six Cardinals from the six nations represented, namely Carafa, Bourbon, Pacheco, Truchsess, de Silva and Pole, who, in conjunction with de Cupis, Carpi, Ridolfi and the Camerlengo, Sforza, should draw up a decree of reform. This was published on January 31st.² An endeavour was made in this to abolish the election intrigues by reviving and emphasizing the regulations of the Church concerning the mode of life in the conclave.³

According to the decree of Gregory X., each Cardinal was allowed to have two conclavists with him. Agents and secretaries of secular princes had, on this occasion, slipped in under the guise of conclavists, who spied out the secrets of the conclave and betrayed them to their masters.⁴ In this manner the secretaries of the two ambassadors, d'Urfé and Mendoza, the secretaries of the King of France, the Duke of Florence

¹ There was already question of such a danger on December 16, 1549. (DRUFFEL, I., 325 ; *cf.* 317). In Paris the question was raised whether, in the event of failure on the part of the Cardinals, a Council could undertake a papal election, and was answered in the affirmative. Renard to Charles V. on February 5, 1550, in DRUFFEL, I., 350 ; *cf.* RIBIER, II., 256.

² MASSARELLI, 113 *seqq.* They are in two forms, the second having a commentary by Massarelli, in which he depicts the abuses of the conclave.

³ What follows is according to MASSARELLI, 114 *seqq.*

⁴ Communication with a Cardinal in the conclave was forbidden by Gregory X. under pain of excommunication. The law was evaded by the conclavists undertaking the communication. *Cf.* Mendoza to Charles V. on December 5, 1549, in DRUFFEL, I., 307.

and the Viceroy of Naples, were to be found among the conclavists. Cardinals whose firmness there was reason to doubt, were given over by the party leaders to safe persons, also called conclavists, who were enjoined to keep a firm hold on them and find out their opinions. To these were joined brothers and relatives of the Cardinals, and nobles and barons who wished to know what a conclave was like,¹ and also, in the case of many Cardinals, their physicians in ordinary. It had thus come to pass that almost every Cardinal had four, and some as many as eight, conclavists with him, and that some 400 persons were together in the conclave.²

In addition to this, the mode of life in the conclave was wanting in that simplicity and austerity which were demanded by the Canon Law, in the interests of as speedy an election as possible. In order to avoid the troublesome restriction to one small room, many Cardinals had annexed the empty cells of the absent members of the Sacred College, whilst others had enlarged their cells by means of a wooden erection in front; windows had also been opened out in the conclave. The limitations in the meals, which were prescribed in the case of a long duration of the election proceedings, were absolutely disregarded. The feasts were of a nature to satisfy a Lucullus,³ while the Cardinals issued invitations to one another, as well as to their conclavists, and both sides sent the most elaborate dishes to their friends!

The most far-reaching abuse, however, lay in the very faulty observance of the enclosure, and it became thereby possible for the foreign princes to influence the election and protract it for an indefinite period. Openings had been made in the walls, in order to communicate with the outside world; letters could be received and dispatched, while d'Urfé boasted

¹ See several names of the agents of the princes and relations of the Cardinals in MASSARELLI, 108, 116. An Abyssinian (Aethiops) was also in the conclave (*ibid.* 87, 126). Cf. MERKLE, II., Proleg. xxxvi., n. 8.

² Dandolo on January 15, 1550, in BROWN, V., n. 627. Concerning the physicians see MARINI, I., 392 *seq.*

³ "ut Luculli mensae . . . viderentur." MASSARELLI, 118.

to his King that he had made a way, with ladders and over roofs, to speak to Guise.¹ The conclavists received permission far too easily to leave the conclave under trifling pretexts, and then return, and it was precisely these people who betrayed the secrets of the conclave everywhere, and were the go-betweens of the princes. When Madruzzo sent his conclavist, Pagnani, with a message, both his boots were so stuffed up with letters that he quite forgot his masters' missive, through thinking of them.²

In face of these abuses, the reform committee decided that each Cardinal should have only three conclavists; among these he could have relatives, if they were not ruling barons, and his physician, but not intimates of another Cardinal. Agents of the princes and ambassadors, barons who had jurisdiction and their subordinates, and all those who were not on the list of conclavists at the beginning of the conclave, should be expelled, and severely punished should they return. In order to deal with ordinary ailments, a Frenchman and a Spaniard should be added to the four physicians of the conclave, of whom three were Italians and one a German, while the number of barbers should also be increased. All unauthorized communication with the outside world, whether by word of mouth or by letter, was strictly forbidden; every Cardinal, with the exception of those who were ill, was to return to the cell originally assigned to him; all additions built on to the cells were to be done away with; and all windows which had been added were to be closed. The conclavists were to eat and sleep in the cells of their masters, while meals were to be made conformable to the regulations of Clement VI. In order to make communication with the outside world impossible, whether for the purpose of obtaining provisions or anything else, arrangements were made similar to those in the convents of nuns. All private meetings were

¹ RIBIER, II., 259. Bonif. Ruggieri relates the same thing of a visit to Cardinal d'Este. PETRUCELLI, II., 31, 46; *cf.* also MUZIO, *Lettere*, 120, 148.

² Gualterius in MERKLE, II., 81.

prohibited. As the election proceedings had often lasted till late in the night, it was ordered that in future, no Cardinal should go out of his cell later than the fifth hour of the evening, while the conclavists had also to withdraw one hour later, both hours being announced by the ringing of a bell. Permission to enter the conclave or to leave it would only be granted by the committee of Cardinals. Special regulations were also made with regard to the custody of the keys of the conclave, while arms were strictly prohibited inside the enclosure.

At the same time as this decree for the reform of the interior conditions of the conclave was promulgated, the prelates charged with the exterior guarding of it, drew up a second regulation with regard to the shutting off of the conclave from the outer world. Specially worthy of note are the orders that all windows and doors leading out from the conclave should be closed, and that the Apostolic palace should be searched every second day to see that no means of egress had been broken open.¹

The reform commission had ordered on February 5th that a rotary lift should be arranged in the wall, similar to those used in convents of nuns, for the reception of provisions, and that not more than one course should be served at a meal. The superfluous conclavists, eighty in number, were all turned out.²

¹ MASSARELLI, 121 *seqq.*

² *Ibid.*, 136; *cf.* FIRMANUS, 129; MUZIO, Lettere, 149. Atti di Soc. Ligur., XXXVIII. (1910), *seqq.* In spite of this, however, it would appear that communication with the outside world was not quite stopped. Endimio Calandra writes to his brother Sabino on February 7, 1550: “*Di Papa hora mai non si pensa, ne si ne ragiona, come ogni cosa viene in puoca reputatione quando va alla lunga. Li poveri r^{mi} sono serati la dentro et non si possono accordare, e come le cose si governano più di fuori che di dentro, consultandosi tutta via coi principi, si ben hanno cacciato fuori li secretarii et gli agenti, che però non si possano mandare lettere, forza è che vadino in lungo.” (Gonzaga Archives, Mantua).

Granted that such orders for reform testify to the desire of the Cardinals finally to arrive at an election, this good will could only be strengthened by the advances which both parties made about the same time, regarding the election intrigues.

Ridolfi, who had been obliged to leave the Vatican on account of illness, had the best prospect of the tiara during the last half of January.¹ It was firmly believed that he would return to the conclave as Pope. After Ridolfi's death, on January 31st,² the French turned their attention to Salviati,³ whom many had, even before the conclave, looked upon as the future Pope, and whose candidature had been put forward again and again. Besides the French party, his old friend Gonzaga and Cardinal della Rovere now declared for him, the latter at the wish of his brother, the Duke of Urbino. What, however, caused a still greater sensation, and soon became a common topic of conversation in the city, was that Alessandro Farnese's brother Ranuccio, and his cousin Sforza, were ready to give Salviati their votes. Most people saw the reason for this change of front in considerations of family policy. Of the four Farnese brothers, Duke Ottavio was son-in-law of the Emperor, and expected from him the possession of Parma. Orazio Farnese, on the other hand, hoped to become the son-in-law of the French king, and had French sympathies. Of the two Farnese Cardinals, Alessandro was more inclined to side with Ottavio, while Ranuccio, on the other hand, had a greater leaning to Orazio. As Ranuccio

¹ FIRMANUS, 113.

² It was reported that Ridolfi had been poisoned by his servant, bribed to do so by Mendoza, and that the confidant of Cosimo de' Medici, Giov. Fran. Lottino, had had a hand in the matter. Cf. MAFFEI in the *Rassegna per la storia di Volterra*, I. (1898), 90 *seq.*, and BRUZZONE in *La Stampa*, 1900, n. 51.

³ The Imperial ambassador, Mendoza, advocated, at least in appearance, the candidature of Salviati (cf. MUZIO, *Lettere*, 131); Cosimo de' Medici was, however, decidedly opposed to him; the Duke wished absolutely for no Florentine. See RANKE, *Histor-biogr. Studien*, Leipsic, 1877, 416 *seq.*

feared that Ottavio would, on the advice of Alessandro, snatch away the Duchy of Castro from Orazio, with the Emperor's help, he was all the more inclined to the French side, especially as he did not wish to jeopardize his brother's scheme for the French marriage by a friendship with the Emperor.¹ Cardinal Sforza, moreover, would not have been unwilling to see Salviati Pope, especially as his sister-in-law was Salviati's niece.

By the accession of the two cousins to Salviati's adherents, his prospects brightened exceedingly. On February 2nd, on which there was no voting, a regular competition took place with regard to Ranuccio and Sforza, the one side endeavouring to hold the two cousins fast, the other to win them back. On the evening of that day, the Imperialists had, after many changes of fortune, succeeded so far, that the two promised to abstain from voting for Salviati, at least on the two following days. Night, a sleepless one for many, brought a temporary end to the canvassing and intrigue; however, the decisive reconciliation of the three Farnese did not take place until the evening of the following day, whereupon the French dropped the candidature of Salviati.

This incident was of the greatest importance for the issue of the conclave. Farnese had discovered that the party discipline, hitherto so strict, might suddenly crumble to pieces, and that any further delay might be dangerous. After Salviati's failure, Guise had also given up hope of getting a Cardinal of French sympathies elected. Nothing therefore remained but to propose a candidate who was neutral, so they again fell back on Giovan Maria del Monte, on whom the eyes of intelligent people had long been fixed,² and for whom the influential Duke of Florence had been working since the beginning of January.³ He was, besides, the only one of the

¹ France, as well as the Emperor, had been endeavouring, since the middle of December, to bring pressure to bear on Farnese by means of the Parma affair. DRUFFEL, I., 330-332 *seq.* 343. RIBIER, II., 261.

² See *Supra.* p. 22.

³ PETRUCCELLI, II., 51 *seqq.*; *cf.* Giorn. stor. della lett. Ital., XLIII., 241.

four Cardinal-Bishops whose candidature had not already been proved impossible.

It was Cardinal Sforza who first drew the attention of the conclave to del Monte at the beginning of February, and gave his approbation to his being put forward.¹ The weariness and disgust which had taken possession of the electors, the death of Ridolfi, the illness of other distinguished Cardinals, and the unhealthy conditions within the conclave, all gave rise to a universal longing for the speedy termination of the election.²

Del Monte was, however, not without opponents. Charles V. had excluded him from the tiara, as well as de Cupis, but Mendoza had thought himself justified in not producing the said document, and the Emperor subsequently approved this proceeding on the part of his ambassador.³ In the conclave itself the determined Guise was an open opponent of del Monte; he repeated shameful stories about him and said he was unworthy of the Papacy.⁴ In Cardinal d'Este, del Monte now found a quite unexpected advocate. Este was himself a candidate for the tiara, and as long as he was under the influence of his cousin, Ercole Gonzaga, had also been opposed to del Monte. His candidature had been roughly rejected by Charles V., and the want of consideration shown by Gonzaga in communicating the Emperor's exclusion to him, had led to a split between him and his cousin. Just at the time of this quarrel del Monte visited Cardinal d'Este and begged him to intervene with Guise on his behalf. Este agreed, and at this visit received such a favourable impression of del Monte, that he now became his zealous adherent.⁵

¹ Maffei in MERKLE, II., 132.

² The conclavists who left the conclave were mostly ill and half dead. The air was so dreadful that the first physician in Rome declared on his entrance into the conclave that an outbreak of the plague was likely to follow. Dandolo on January 22, 1550, in BROWN, V., n. 630.

³ MAURENBRECHER, 229, n. 9; 225, n. 20.

⁴ Maffei in MERKLE, II., 59. RIBIER, II., 268.

⁵ Maffei in MERKLE, II., 136.

What Este had begun with Guise, Sforza now completed. The French Cardinal, at a chance meeting with the latter, expressed his displeasure at the state of affairs in the conclave and at the obstinacy of the parties. Sforza replied that it was in Guise's own power to bring the matter to an end, by refraining from his support of Salviati. The French, he continued, had shown their power sufficiently up till now, and by an exaggeration of their claims might in the end lose everything.

Wearied of the fruitless voting, Guise agreed with this idea, and proposed to elect Cervini. To this, however, Sforza could not give his assent, and thereupon Guise happened, as if by accident, to speak of del Monte. Sforza at once acquiesced in this, but begged him first of all to get the consent of Farnese, as nothing could be arranged without the latter's approval.¹

On February 6th, as Guise was walking up and down one of the corridors after dinner in conversation with Ranuccio Farnese and Sforza, they were joined by Alessandro Farnese. After some time Ranuccio and Sforza withdrew, and the two leaders could freely interchange their ideas. Contrary to all expectation, they were quickly of one mind with regard to the elevation of del Monte.²

They at first, as it appears, fixed the election for February 8th, but already on the morning of February 7th, there were rumours in the conclave concerning the candidature of del Monte. In the afternoon, when the Cardinals, as was customary, deliberated in the Pauline Chapel, these formed the chief topic of conversation and found little opposition. At the

¹ *Ibid.*, II., 136.

² See Gaulterius in MERKLE, II., 139 n. 2. Massarelli had most likely been obliged to leave the conclave on February 5 with the superfluous conclavists. His report of the events that followed is taken from Petrus Paulus de Breuibis (see MERKLE, II., Proleg., xli. *seq.*) Cf. concerning the attitude of A. Farnese, and his letter to Prospero Santa Croce, in CUGNONI, *Prose ined.* di A. Caro, 145.

approach of darkness, the Cardinals withdrew, but the negotiations concerning del Monte still continued.

The three relatives of Paul III. assembled in the cell of Cardinal Maffei, with Crescenzi, Medici, Cornaro and Savelli; they all urged speed and counted the votes at their disposal. Guise had offered twenty-one, which, with the votes of de Silva, Gaddi and the eight assembled in Maffei's cell, formed the two-thirds majority, which, with the forty-seven electors then present, was thirty-one.¹ It was extremely advisable to set about the winning of further votes especially as the Spaniards did not wish for del Monte's election, and Pacheco and Mendoza had already gone to Toledo to deliberate on counter-action. Cardinal Maffei, sent by the adherents of Farnese, now joined them and Farnese soon arrived himself, and later on de Silva. Their united endeavours were at last successful in winning over Toledo and Mendoza, but Pacheco persisted in violent opposition and demanded at least a delay long enough to enable him to consult Gonzaga and Madruzzo. The chief difficulty for the Spaniards lay in the fact that del Monte was considered to be excluded by the Emperor. To this Farnese successfully opposed the Imperial letter of which he was aware, and in which no objection was made to del Monte. Medici was now sent to Gonzaga, and Maffei to Pole, who was at that moment deliberating with Truchsess. Pole and Truchsess gave their agreement, provided that del Monte reached the full number of votes, while Gonzaga raised no objections. When Medici left him he also stood up and joined Madruzzo, where he found Pacheco and Cueva.

The French, who had in the meanwhile been working for del Monte, now sent Sermoneta and Capodiferro to the Cardinals assembled in Maffei's cell, and made the proposal that del Monte should now be elevated to the Papal throne by a general rendering of homage. Farnese agreed, and sent a message to the French to assemble in the Pauline Chapel, where he and the others would join them.

¹ Thus according to MASSARELLI, 141. Reckoned truly the two-thirds majority was 32.

On the way to the chapel, Farnese entered Madruzzo's cell, where he met Gonzaga, Pacheco and Cueva. His attempt to induce them to join, was, however, without success. With the exception of the four named, and apart from del Monte himself, and the sick Cardinal Carpi, who agreed to del Monte's election, all the others, forty-one in number, assembled in the Pauline Chapel. As they all unanimously and in a loud voice called for del Monte as Pope, Guise and Farnese, clasping hands, hurried to del Monte and brought him into the chapel, where he was embraced and kissed by all present. Some acclaimed him in a loud voice and others more quietly, but the noise was so great that no one could hear his own voice. Then the Cardinal-Dean ordered them to be quiet; noisy proceedings must be avoided and they must proceed to pay homage in a proper manner.

The Papal throne was now erected in front of the altar, and Cardinal del Monte took his place thereon. The Cardinals occupied their accustomed seats and the names of all present were then read over by the master of ceremonies. They voted unanimously for del Monte as Pope. In order to demonstrate this, they advanced to the throne and showed him the manifestations of respect customary in the case of the Pope. Del Monte then declared that he accepted the election, and ordered that an official deed should be drawn up concerning it. He emphasized the fact that a subsequent scrutiny could not affect the election, which was already accomplished. By now it was already night, and del Monte, led by de Cupis and Salviati, withdrew to his cell. To the inquiry of de Cupis as to what name he should assume, he answered that he would assume the name of Julius III. out of gratitude to Julius II. who had first conferred lustre on his family by the elevation of Antonio del Monte to the cardinalate.¹ Lastly Madruzzo, Gonzaga, Pacheco and Cueva came to del Monte's cell and also paid him homage.

Meanwhile the great event had become known outside the

¹ His motto was: *Vias tuas, Domine, demonstra mihi.* CIACONIUS, III., 746.

conclave. All the walls, doors and windows were already being broken open, and the nobles, prelates and intimates of the new Pope were streaming in and would not allow themselves to be turned out either by threats or commands. Neither supper nor the night's rest were to be thought of in the conclave.

The next day, February 8th, a last ballot took place early in the morning, merely as a matter of form. Del Monte's voting paper bore the name of Toledo, all the others that of del Monte. All the Cardinals paid him homage. Then the election was announced to the people, the new Pope being carried into St. Peter's, where his foot was kissed by everyone.¹

Del Monte's elevation was so unexpected that even on the day on which it took place, a letter from Rome announced that no one was thinking of the election, or speaking about it.²

The issue of the conclave surprised everyone, foreign diplomats as well as the Romans.³ The inhabitants of the Eternal City rejoiced more at the fact that they again had a Pope, than because the majority of votes had been given to Cardinal del Monte. Endimio Calandra, however, said, even on February 8th, that he believed, from the knowledge he possessed of the new Pope, that his reign would be a good one.⁴ In fact, the universal opinion was favourable to Julius III.⁵

¹ MASSARELLI, 143 *seq.* Cf. J. V. Meggens' report in the *Archiv für schweiz. Reform.-Gesch.*, III., 507.

² See the above mentioned (p. 36, n. 2) *letter of E. Calandra of February 7, 1550. On the 8 he wrote: " *Questa notte passata quando manco se vi pensava o hier' sera s'è fatto il papa." (Gonzaga Archives, Mantua).

³ See DANDOLO, 347.

⁴ See the *letter in Appendix No. 1 (Gonzaga Archives, Mantua).

⁵ So, *write the Bolognese ambassadors, Giorgio Magio and Lod. de' Rossi on February 8, 1550, there is universal joy in Rome at the " ottimo principe dal valor et integrità del quale si spera ogni bene." (State Archives, Bologna). See also Michelangelo, *Lettere*, ed. MILANESI, 527 (wrongly dated; cf. THODE, I., 450 *seq.*)

although there were not wanting those who judged him in quite a different manner.¹

The Emperor, as well as the French king, whose endeavours to procure the tiara for a pronounced adherent had not been crowned with success, could not be pleased with the issue of the conclave. Cosimo de' Medici, to whom the elevation of del Monte was chiefly attributed² in Rome, endeavoured to soothe Charles V.³ Cardinal Farnese apologized to the Emperor and the French king for the result of the election,⁴ while Guise also did his best to make the issue of the election proceedings agreeable to his master.⁵

In the college of Cardinals there was a general feeling of satisfaction, especially as Julius III. was very generous in giving proofs of his clemency, even in these early days.⁶ The reform party had the fewest reasons for being satisfied, seeing that they had not been successful with any of their candidates, and that, not from want of zeal, but owing to the machinations of the princes. Those, however, who were of a strictly ecclesiastical bias, did not despair, because they knew from the Council of Trent,⁷ that the new Pope, if he did not belong to their party, had so much understanding of the position of the Church that they might hope from him for a furtherance of their strivings after reform.

¹ MUZIO, *Lettere*, 152, who is, however, very soon of a much more favourable opinion (156 *seq.*) BROSCHE (I., 191) lays great stress on the first opinion, but completely ignores the later changed view.

² * "Il grido di questa corte è ch'il duca nostro sa fare Papi non si potria dire facilmente il gran nome c'ha aquistato doppo la promotione di S. Stà predicando ciascuno S.E. da infinitissime ottime parti che si trovano in lei." B. Buonanni, dated Roma 22 febr. 1550. (State Archives, Florence).

³ PETRUCELLI, II., 62. Cosimo also reported it to Henry II.; see PALANDRI, 66.

⁴ Cf. CUGNONI, *Prose ined.* di A. Caro, 131 *seq.*, 144 *seqq.*

⁵ See DRUFFEL, I., 350-358.

⁶ * "In somma si vede una comune contentezza in tutti li cardinali, cosi dell' una come dell' altra fattione, e S. Stà mostra una eguale buona volontà verso tutti, essendo con ciascuno larghissimo di gratie . . . A. Serristori, Rome February 12, 1550. (State Archives, Florence). ⁷ Cf. EHSES, *Conc. Trid.*, V., 780, n. 314.

CHAPTER II.

PREVIOUS LIFE, CHARACTER AND BEGINNING OF THE REIGN OF JULIUS III.

THE family of the Ciochi del Monte¹ bore the name of their original seat, Monte San Savino, a small town in the district of Arezzo, beautifully situated on a hill in the lovely Chiana Valley, not far from Lucignano ; it is known as the birthplace of the celebrated sculptor, Andrea Sansovino. The grandfather of Julius III., Fabiano, was a distinguished advocate in the town², and to this day in the principal church a beautiful tomb may be seen, which his son, Antonio, afterwards Cardinal, erected to his beloved father, who died in 1498. A second

¹ See R. RESTORELLI, *Notizie delle famiglie di Monte, Borgognonio, Guidalotti e Simoncelli (written 1771), in the Arch. com. at Monte San Savino. Cf. TESORONI, 32 *seq.* and LITTA f. 16.

² Cf. for what follows O. PANVINIUS, *De Julii vita ante pontificatum*, in MERKLE, II., 146 *seq.* ; DANDOLO, 353 *seqq.* ; LITTA, f. 16, where there is an illustration of the tomb at Monte San Savino. Concerning the arms of Julius III. (a splendid example at Todi ; ALINARI, 5225) see PASINI FRASSONI, 36 *seq.*, and ORLANDINI in the *Riv. del collegio araldico*, V., Rome, 1907. The large coat of arms of Julius III. in the courtyard of the Palazzo Pubblico at Viterbo, with the inscription : "Julio III. P.M. c [ivitas] Viterb. erexit provinciam patrimonii gubernante Rodolpho Pio card. de Carpo legato 1552," was on the Porta di S. Luca, destroyed in 1705, which was embellished under Julius III. (see *Reformat.*, XLVII., 118. City Archives, Viterbo). The present Porta Fiorentina was built on the site of the Porta di S. Luca.

son of Fabiano, Vincenzo, had embraced the study of jurisprudence, and became consistorial advocate in Rome and one of the most respected lawyers in the city. Two daughters, Ludovica and Jacopa, were born of his marriage with Christofora Saracini of Siena, the former of whom married Roberto de' Nobili, the latter Francia della Corgna, and three sons, Giovan Maria, Baldovino and Costanzo.

Giovan Maria del Monte was born on September 10th, 1487, in Rome, in the Rione di Parione, in which his parents' house was situated, not far from the Mellini palace. As he lost his father as early as 1504, his uncle, Antonio del Monte, Auditor of the Rota and Archbishop of Siponto (Manfredonia), took the promising youth under his care. He gave him a most excellent tutor¹ in the person of the humanist, Raffaello Brandolini, and sent him to study law in Perugia and Siena,² afterwards bringing him to Rome, where he obtained for the talented young man the position of chamberlain to Julius II. When the Pope invested Antonio del Monte with the purple,³ on March 10th, 1511, he resigned the archbishopric of Siponto in favour of his nephew.⁴ Giovan Maria del Monte received the flattering offer of preaching the opening sermon⁵ at the fifth sitting of the Lateran Council, on February 16th, 1513,

¹ Concerning R. Brandolini see Vol. VI., of this work, p. 94.

² Here Ambrosius Catharinus was his teacher ; see LAUCHERT 31.

³ Cf. our statements concerning this, as well as the confidential relations between Antonio and Julius II., in Vol. VI., pp. 274, 344 of this work. The picture of Antonio in the Stanze is not authenticated ; *ibid.*

⁴ In the year 1520 Giovan Maria also received the bishopric of Pavia, through the resignation of his uncle ; this he retained until 1530, and then again from 1544 onwards (for this *cf.* EHSES, Conc. Trid., IV., 570 n. 1 and CARCERERI in the Arch. Trid., XVIII., 83 n.) While archbishop of Siponto Giovan Maria del Monte completed the building of S. Maria Maggiore there. SCHULTZ, Denkmäler Südtaliens, I., Dresden, 1860, 216.

⁵ Printed in HARDOUIN, Coll. Conc., IX., 1664 *seq.* Cf. HEFELE-HERGENRÖTHER, Konziliengeschichte, VIII., 533.

and acquitted himself of his task to the satisfaction of everyone.

The honoured name which del Monte had gained under Julius II., he retained under the Medici Popes, Leo. X. and Clement VII. During the reign of Clement VII. he occupied the position of Governor of Rome on two occasions, during which he proved himself to be a strong upholder of justice, winning at the same time the good-will of everyone by his pleasant manners. Even then, however, his tendency towards pleasure was remarked, although this in no way interfered with the carrying out of his duties. The failings of Clement VII., and his vacillating policy, were reflected in the Archbishop of Siponto in a most marked manner, even as early as 1525.¹ The sack of Rome was the consequence of this attitude. Giovan Maria del Monte very nearly lost his life on this occasion ; he was among the hostages whom Clement VII. was obliged to provide at his capitulation on June 5th, 1527, for the security of his payments. As the Pope had not succeeded, in spite of all his efforts, in producing the full amount, the mercenaries seized the hostages. These unfortunates were twice led in chains to a gallows erected in the Campo de' Fiori, and threatened with death. They only succeeded at the end of November, on St. Andrew's day, in making their keepers drunk and thus escaping from them.² Del Monte never forgot the agony he endured in those terrible days, and when he became Pope, he erected a church in front of the Porta del Popolo, to the saint on whose feast he had been saved.

Under Paul III. the Archbishop of Siponto now became vice-legate of Bologna, and also held the office of an auditor of the Apostolic Chamber ; he fulfilled the duties of both offices to the perfect satisfaction of the Pope, who rewarded him by investing him with the purple in the celebrated creation of December 22nd, 1536.³

¹ Cf. Vol. IX. of this work, p. 286 n. 3.

² Cf. Vol. IX. of this work, pp. 422, 461, 465.

³ Cf. Vol. XI. of this work, p. 159.

The Cardinal of San Vitale, as del Monte was now generally named, after his titular church, deserved this distinction, because, as Panvinio points out, few men had laboured at the Curia so steadfastly, faithfully and honestly, and with such diligent zeal as he, while neither pride, avarice nor covetousness were to be found in him, nor any neglect nor want of care.”¹ Indeed, he distinguished himself to such an extent, both in the Reform Commission and elsewhere, that Paul III. appointed him as his representative at the Council of Trent, together with Cervini and Pole.² He devoted himself in this capacity almost exclusively to questions of ecclesiastical law, as he was really more a canonist than a theologian; he also showed the greatest zeal in the campaign for reform.³ He defended the rights of the presidents, as well as those of the Holy See, with great energy, but his excitable temperament was the cause of several sharp discussions which arose between him and the members of the Council. On the whole, however, no one can deny to his management of business, the tribute of impartiality and objectivity.⁴

The appearance of Julius III. was so unsympathetic that it was difficult for artists to paint his portrait.⁵ His face, which

¹ Panvinio in MERKLE, II., 147.

² Cf. Vol. XI. of this work, p. 198, and Vol. XII., pp. 154, 209 *seqq.*

³ Cf. *supra* p. 44.

⁴ Cf. HEFNER, 30 *seq.*, and the evidence quoted there.

⁵ Cf. the *Reports of B. Buonanni, Rome, April 9, 1550 (. . . Fra otto giorni mi dice il Cecchi che si stamperà delle monete di S.Stà; ha detto che mi vuole far havere quel ritratto che fa m^r Giorgio, et è cosa da non credersi, che non si sia trovato sino a qui pittore c’habbi saputo corre la vera effigie et profilo del naso di S.Stà, la quale fa il più bel ridersene del mondo) and April 14. Not until August 9 did Buonanni announce: *M. Prospero pittore fini un ritratto di S.Stà in tela, il quale sta assai bene. See also the *report of Serristori of March 27, 1550, in the State Archives, Florence, according to which they wished to apply to Titian. The commission given to Vasari to paint the portrait of Julius III., appears not to have been executed; see KALLAB, 84.

was framed by a long grey beard, gave the impression of a rough coarse peasant. The sharply bent aquiline nose was disproportionately large, the lips closely pressed together, the eyes sharp and piercing.¹ This tall, powerful man was a heavy eater, but was not partial to the delicacies favoured by the gourmets of the Renaissance period. The vegetable he preferred to all others was the onion, and these were delivered, expressly for him, in immense quantities from Gaeta. It was in keeping with the peasant traits of Julius III. that he should often, in moments of expansion, have behaved in a manner little in keeping with his dignity. Not only did he disregard all ceremonial,² but he also gave offence by his demeanour. The free and unseemly jests with which he

¹ See Panvinus in MERKLE, II., 147. Concerning the portraits of Julius III. see KENNER in the Jahrb. der kunsthistor. Sammlungen des Allerhöchsten Kaiserhauses, XVII., 147; that from the Ambraser collection in Vienna is illustrated in LITTA f. 16, where there is also an illustration of the bronze statue of the Pope, more than life size, in front of the Cathedral in Perugia, executed by Vincenzo Danti (cf. A. Rossi in the Giorn. della erudiz. art., I., and Giorn. stor. della lett. Ital. Suppl., III., 25, 93), which has been much spoken of lately, as its mantle (celebrated on account of the beautiful manner in which the folds of the drapery fell, and the representation of the Triumph of the Faith depicted thereon) was stolen from it in February, 1911. A second statue of Julius III., in marble, is in the Palazzo Saraceni in Siena (see Histor.-polit. Blätter, LXXXIV., 51 seq.) also a good likeness in the council chamber of the Castle of Caprarola. A portrait of Julius III. (mentioned *infra* Chap. XIII.) by Fabrizio Boschi, has not yet been published. The coarse features of the Pope are specially noticeable in his medals (see CIIACONIVS, III., 755, VENUTI, 89 seq.) Complete collection in the cabinet of coins in the Vatican. Very beautiful medals of Julius III. are also to be found in the Kaiser Friedrich Museum, Berlin, Hall 16, case 3. Illustration of the medal by Cavino in MÜNTZ, III., 240. Concerning the medals of Julius III. see SERAFINI, 247 seq.

² Cf. in Appendix No. 4 the *report of Buonanni of February 23, 1550 (State Archives, Florence).

spiced his feasts often caused great embarrassment to his guests ;¹ many of the anecdotes related of him, however, are not founded in fact.²

The Pope lessened the respect in which he was held, as much by his want of refinement in manners, as by the sudden outbursts of anger in which he indulged. These, however, were as quickly over as they had broken out, and it was an easy matter to bring him again to a state of tranquillity.³ As is the case with persons of the sanguine temperament which the Pope undoubtedly possessed, his moods changed with unexpected rapidity, expressing themselves in unpremeditated words and premature declarations. He was completely wanting in steadfastness and firmness. All correspondents praise his goodness and mildness, but also deplore his weakness, and his inconstant and changeable behaviour.⁴ Nervous and easily dispirited,⁵ he was in no way capable of dealing with

¹ PANVINIUS, 148. P. Olivo reports to S. Calandra concerning Julius III., on February 15, 1550: *Giovedì disenando gli si portarono inanzi certe polpette di vitello, le quali subito ch'egli vidde disse evi dentro aglio? Rispose lo scalco: Padre santo no; all'hora mezo sdegnato disse levatele adesso, come se fosse giovane de XV. anni et havesse lo stomaco di struzzo." (Gonzaga Archives, Mantua). The joke which BESSO quotes (Roma nei proverbi, Rome, 1889, 141) is quite free from anything objectionable.

² See the collection in BAYLE, Dictionnaire hist. et crit., II., Amsterdam, 1730, 775 *seqq.* Cf. WOLF, Lect. mem., II., 638, 812 *seq.*; see also BUCHMANN, Geflügelte Worte, Berlin, 1905, 548.

³ See besides Dandolo and Panvinus *loc. cit.* Andreas Masius in LACOMBLET, Archiv., VI., 156; *Legaz. di Serristori*, 272, 275, 280. Cf. also the careful characterization of Julius III. by PALLAVICINI (II, 7, 4 and 13, 10, 8).

⁴ See besides PANVINIUS and MASIUS *loc. cit.* especially *Legaz. di Serristori*, 278. A code *Report of Serristori of December 23, 1552, is characteristic, in which he states: "et in fatto con. S.S^{ta} chi vuole haver buono, vinca, perche si vede in le. sempre qualche mutatione secondo l'evento delle cose" (Stat. Archives, Florence).

⁵ See Mendoza in DÖLLINGER, I., 192. Cf. Tournon in ROMIER, 239 and Nonciat. de France, I., xlv.

difficult situations, while his actions were always hampered by a want of decision. He wished to be on good terms with everyone, liked to see contented faces about him, and preferred the outward lustre of power to the actual possession of it. As he was difficult to fathom, diplomatic negotiations were not easily carried on with him ;¹ whoever tried to induce him to do anything by means of cunning found they had spoilt matters entirely.² A German correspondent, Andreas Masius, emphasizes the fact that he liked to be respected and looked upon as one who had risen from modest circumstances to unexpected heights.³

In spite of all his eloquence and the versatility of his culture, his mind was more fitted to seek out that which was desirable, than to keep a firm hold of what was already in his possession. He was especially fond of music,⁴ as well as of jurisprudence, by which his father and his uncle had made their fortunes. He fulfilled his religious duties conscientiously. Panvinio, who is by no means prejudiced in his favour, testifies that he said Mass frequently and with great devotion ;⁵ Massarelli also repeatedly praises the piety which characterized the Pope.⁶ His love of pomp and his worldly nature offer a violent contrast to this piety. As in the case of his predecessor, the Farnese Pope, whom in other respects he in no way resembled, there was always a struggle going on in Julius III. between the old and new order of things. He remained, however, in many respects, a true child of the Renaissance, during which period he had grown up. This showed itself also in the careless

¹ See Cosimo I.'s criticism in DESJARDINS, III., 317.

² *Bisogna usar gran destrezza et andar con molta advertentia con S.Stà et chi la vuol tirar con arte a una cosa rumpe il tutto. Buonanni on November 16, 1550 (State Archives, Florence).

³ LACOMBLET, Archiv, VI., 162.

⁴ See *ibid.* 156.

⁵ In MERKLE, II., 148.

⁶ Cf. MASSARELLI, 155, 158, 160, 161, 164, 199, 202, 206, 210, 212, 213, 215, 220.

prodigality which he displayed even at the beginning of his reign.¹

The Romans rejoiced when the new Pope at once abolished the flour-tax,² introduced by Paul III., and distributed gifts and benefits on all sides with a generous hand. He limited the *Spolium* law, and the heirs and servants of the Cardinals could, for the future, inherit legacies from them. It was specially noted at the bestowal of gifts and benefits that those Cardinals, such as Gonzaga and Madruzzo, who had been most active in opposing the election of Julius III. were chosen for particular distinction. Gonzaga received the bishopric of Pavia, and was so graciously treated in other respects, that Pirro Olivo of Mantua considered that it went too far. When he took leave of the Pope on his departure, Julius III. presented him with a valuable antique emerald.³ Madruzzo was at once paid 20,000 ducats for his expenses in Trent. A Mantuan correspondent tells us that as early as February 15th, there was not a Cardinal in the Curia who was not deeply indebted to the generosity of the Pope.⁴ Julius III. also gave

¹ Cf. for what follows, besides MASSARELLI, 151 *seq.*, the report to Ferdinand I. in DRUFFEL, I., 358 *seq.* 403; Dandolo's letter in DE LEVA, V., 138 *seq.*; BAUMGARTEN, Sleidan, 230; MUZIO, Lettere, 156 *seq.*; the *letter of E. Calandra, dated Rome, February 11, 1550, and that of P. Olivo of February 12, in the Gonzaga Archives Mantua (see Appendix No. 2) as well as the *report of Serristori of February 26, 1550, in the State Archives, Florence.

² The *Bulla gratiosa* of March 8, 1549 (stil. Flor.) concerning the repeal of the tax on imported corn, in the Casanatense Library, Rome.

³ See Olivo's *letter of February 12, 1559, in Appendix No. 2, and Serristori's report of February 26, 1550, in which he says: "Il car^{le} di Mantua andò a espedirsi da S.Stà et oltre alle gratie concesseli come per l'ultime si scrisse a V.E. gli fu liberale S.B^{no} d'uno smeraldo bellissimo che fu trovato agl'anni passati nella sepoltura d'Honorio, con intaglio d'una testa d'un imperatore, che valeva 3 mila scudi." (State Archives, Florence).

⁴ *Roma si contenta assai del elletione et n'è cardinale che non sia obligatissimo alla liberalità di Giulio III. G. Fr. Arrivabene,

lavishly in all directions quite regardless of the very unsatisfactory financial situation.¹ The dignitaries of the Curia declared in delight that the Golden Age had returned. The gay temperament of Julius III. soon dissipated all the forebodings to which his impetuous disposition had given rise. The new sovereign, who at once gave permission for the Carnival amusements to take place, became popular with extraordinary rapidity.² The general satisfaction was increased by the conciliatory and peaceful policy which the Pope adopted. Girolamo Sauli, Archbishop of Bari, was at once sent to Parma with orders to give up the town to Ottavio Farnese. In order to hasten the restoration, the Pope appeased the Commandant, Camillo Orsini, by paying him out of his own money, giving him the increased amount of 30,000 gold scudi, instead of the 20,000 originally demanded.³ Ascanio Colonna received pardon and restoration as early as February 17th. The Baglione were also again put in possession of their rights, and part of their municipal freedom was restored to the people of Perugia.⁴ Julius III. adopted adequate measures

dated Rome, February 15, 1550 (Gonzaga Archives, Mantua). Cf. also LANCIANI, III., 177.

¹ Cf. MASSARELLI, 160; Carte Strozzi, I., 432; *report of Serristori of March 4, 1550 (State Archives, Florence), and the Instruction in PIEPER, 143. During the conclave the nuncios could not be paid; see Lett. dei princ., XVI., n. 242-243 (Secret Archives of the Vatican).

² See in Appendix No. 3, the *report of Olivo of February 15, 1550. (Gonzaga Archives, Mantua).

³ *Domandando il card. Farnese S.Stà 20,000 scudi da pagare le spese fatte in Parma per far uscire il s. Camillo, risposono alcuni: Padre santo, non si fara niente, perchè la somma non e gran fatto meno di 25,000. Disse all hora il papa: dienghesi 30,000 . . . et così fu espedito con lettere di cambio di 30,000 scudi d'oro. Queste così fatte dimostrationi fanno stupire il mondo et concludere ognuno che costui ha da farsi schiavo il mondo, writes P. Olivo on February 15, 1550 (Gonzaga Archives, Mantua).

⁴ See MASSARELLI, 155; **Letter of Lod. Strozza to S. Calandra, dated Bologna, February 16, 1550 (Gonzaga Archives,

for the settlement of the dissensions and troubles which had arisen in several parts of the Papal dominions during the long conclave.¹ He forbade all expatriated persons to seek a residence in the States of the Church. To the Conservatori he gave the most binding assurances of the strict administration of justice, and of the provision of Rome with grain, and earnestly enjoined them to fulfil their duty, especially with regard to speculators in corn.²

Above all, the new Pope made it his business to assure the rulers of the two great powers, now facing each other in fierce enmity, of his good dispositions and honourable intentions. It was on their assent and co-operation that the solution of the two problems, which Julius III. had received unsolved from the pontificate of his predecessor, was dependent. These were: the confirmation of the Farnese in Parma, and the continuance of the Council of Trent. It was extremely difficult to win over Charles V. and Henry II. on these two matters, for what the one agreed to the other immediately

Mantua); *Reports of Serristori of March 3, 9, and 10, and April 4, 1550 (State Archives, Florence); MUZIO, Lettere 156, 161. The *Briefs concerning the restoration of the ancient privileges of Perugia and of the magistrates there, are dated February 28 and April 21, 1553 (Library, Perugia). The fact is perpetuated by a fresco in the Palazzo Comunale, and is inscribed on the statue mentioned before (p. 49, n. 1). See the inscription in CIACONIUS, III., 769.

¹ See the *briefs to P. A. de Angelis, epic. Nepesino, dated February 26, 1550 (*ad inquirendum contra Firmanos*); to Sebast. Rutilonus (Commissary-court against the disturbers of the peace in Terni, "*cupientes statum nostrum facinorosis hominibus expurgare*"), dated March 3; B. Saccho (against Count of Pitigliano), March 26; Communitati Iteramne, dated March 26; Gubernatoribus Spolet., Interamni et Reat. (against Seb. Arronius, guilty of high treason) dated April 15; Rutilio Troilo (against Ct. of Pitigliano), dated April 22 (Arm. 44, t. 55, n. 71, 106, 221, 224, 305, 338. Secret Archives of the Vatican).

² See in Appendix No. 6 the *report of Serristori of February 26, 1550. (State Archives, Florence).

repudiated. Besides this there was the fact that the elevation of Cardinal del Monte to the Papacy had not been in accordance with the wishes of either the Emperor or the King of France.¹ Julius III. was therefore all the more determined to win over the two princes. He confided this difficult task, in a very shrewd manner, not to the usual nuncios, but to the adherents and confidants of the respective monarchs. The mission to the Emperor was entrusted to Pedro de Toledo as early as February 16th, 1550, and that to Henry II. to the Abbot Rosetto.² The Pope himself drew up the instructions for both ; in order that these should be effective it was essential that the documents to be communicated to both princes should be carefully decided on. Everything, therefore, which might give offence was scrupulously avoided. Both rulers were exhorted to unity and peace, as only in this manner could the grievous wounds inflicted on the Church be healed. Toledo was to assure the Emperor that the Pope intended to pursue at all times an honourable, open and free policy in all matters, and that he was prepared to co-operate with him for the restoration of peace in the Church by the continuance of the Council of Trent, taking it at the same time for granted that the difficulties in the way would be removed, which could easily be accomplished with the help of the Emperor.

In the instructions for Rosetto, express mention of the Council is carefully avoided, and stress is only laid on the readiness of the Pope to do everything necessary to promote the glory of God, the extirpation of heresy, and to secure peace and unity among Christian nations. The transference of Parma to Ottavio Farnese, the son-in-law of Charles V., required no justification as far as the latter was concerned, but in the case of Henry II. the Pope brought forward a number of weighty reasons for this measure. Besides the promise of the

¹ The above historical facts are fully brought out by PIEPER (p. 4).

² See MASSARELLI, 155. The instructions for both ambassadors in DRUFFEL, I., 364 *seq.*, 368 *seq.* Cf. PIEPER, 4 *seq.*, 139 *seq.*, where there are also emendations of the text.

election capitulation, he laid special stress on the fact that this was the only way of depriving the Emperor of an excuse for taking up arms, and thus of preserving the peace of Italy.

While both ambassadors were on their way, the coronation of Julius III. took place with great pomp on February 22nd, 1550, amid a mighty concourse of people.¹ Two days later the Jubilee, proclaimed by Paul III., was solemnly inaugurated by the opening of the Holy Door. Countless pilgrims, mostly from Italy, had assembled for the celebrations, which were to last till the Christmas Eve of the current year. Among those who endeavoured to gain the Jubilee indulgence was to be found Michael Angelo. The crowd at the bestowal of the Papal Benediction on Easter Day consisted of 50,000 persons.² The Confraternity of the Most Holy Trinity, founded shortly

¹ See besides MASSARELLI, 156 and the **Diario di Cola Coleine Romano* (Cod. N. II., 32, Chigi Library) the pamphlet *La sontuosa festa con l'apparato fatto per la coronatione di N.S. Iulio III.* (Copy in State Library, Munich), the *report of the Bolognese ambassadors of February 22, 1550 (State Archives, Bologna), and that of Buonanni of February 23, 1550, with the inscription of the "palco" (State Archives, Florence). The coronation cost 15,000 aurei; see MASSARELLI, 262. -

² See J. v. Meggens' report in the *Archiv für schweiz. Reform., Gesch.*, III., 511; MASSARELLI, 157, 166; *ibid.* 173, 174, 177, 198 206 concerning the crowds of pilgrims. Cf. also *Arch. per l'Umbria*, III., 53; *Lett. al Aretino*, II., 408, and **Diario di Cola Coleine* (Chigi Library). Serristori describes the opening of the Holy Door, at which a great crowd was present, in spite of the rain, in a *report of February 26, 1550, (State Archives, Florence). Cf. there also the *report of Vinc. Ricobaldis of February 24, 1550. The hammer used by the Pope at this ceremony, a magnificent specimen of the goldsmiths' art, falsely attributed to Benvenuto Cellini (PLON, Cellini, 314 *seq.*, 393), is now in the National Museum, Munich (see THURSTON, 51, and 85 with Illustration). Concerning the celebration of the Jubilee of 1551 in Florence, see *Riv. delle bibl.*, XVII., 94 *seq.* Concerning the Jubilee see MANNI, 116; DE WAAL, *Campo Santo*, 86; *Das heilige Jahr*, Munster, 1900, 41 *seq.* With regard to Michael Angelo see VASARI, VII., 228.

before at S. Salvatore in Campo, by a Florentine layman, Philip Neri, took charge of the poor and sick pilgrims ; this Confraternity developed later into a large institution of world-wide fame, for the help of the needy and indigent.¹

The Pope declared, even at his first consistory, which took place on February 28th, 1550, his firm intention of labouring for the reform of the Church and the peace of Christendom.² He announced at the beginning of March that he would nominate a Congregation of Cardinals, who would confer with regard to the reform of the clergy.³ In a secret consistory of March 10th, Julius III. again emphasized, in a long address, his zeal for religion and his desire to carry on the Council, as well as his intentions concerning reform. He considered there were three reasons for the hatred the princes felt for the clergy : the avarice of the heads of the Curia, the thoughtless bestowal of benefices and the exaggerated luxury of the clergy. He intended to abolish the abuses of the Curia, chiefly by the reform of the Dataria, and would entrust to Cardinals de Cupis, Carafa, Sfondrato, Crescenzi, Pole and Cibo the task of deliberating upon the best measures to adopt for this purpose. He promised to give the orders requisite for the proper distribution of benefices and the restriction of luxury in the immediate future.⁴ The Pope accordingly, on March 19th, 1550, again

¹ Cf. TACCHI VENTURI, I., 356 *seq.* ; THURSTON, 85, 260 *seqq.* ; KERR, Pippo Buono, London, 1908, 58 *seqq.* Further details concerning Filippo Neri will be found in the continuation of this work. [Cf. CAPECELATRO. *Life of St. Philip Neri*. English translation by T. A. Pope. (Editor's Note).]

² See MASSARELLI, 158 and the *letter of Serristori of March 1, 1550. (State Archives, Florence).

³ *Letter of Serristori of March 3, 1550. (State Archives, Florence).

⁴ See *Acta consist. (Consistorial Archives) ; letter of Cardinal Truchsess in MEICHELBECK, Hist. Frising., II., 2, 356 ; *Report of Serristori of March 10, 1550 (State Archives, Florence) ; Dandolo in BROWN V., n. 652. Cf. SCHWEITZER, Gesch. der Reform, 52-53.; where, however, it is erroneously stated that the consistory of March 10 was the first (see *supra* n. 2) Mas-

laid stress on the decree of his predecessor forbidding the accumulation of several bishoprics in the hands of one Cardinal. A Bull of February 22nd had already regulated the power of the Penitentiary.¹ The commission of Cardinals was next engaged with the issue of reform decrees for the Eternal City during the time of Jubilee ; the strictest regulations were made with regard to ecclesiastical and police surveillance, with a view to putting an end to the most glaring improprieties during such celebrations.²

The solemn ceremony of taking possession of the Lateran had to be deferred on account of the weather ; it only took place on June 24th, 1550.³ The Romans had previously witnessed the brilliant spectacle of the entry of the numerous embassies for the *obedientia*, which proved that the various princes of Europe still held fast to the ancient pious union with the Holy See, in spite of the great defection in the north. On March 25th the Pope received the congratulations of the Emperor's ambassador, Luis de Avila, and on the following day Claude d'Urfé rendered him the *obedientia* in the name of the French king, the ambassador of Philip II. doing the same on March 27th, and the representative of the King of the Romans, Ferdinand I., on the 28th. The Dukes of Urbino and Ferrara had come to Rome in person in order to swear allegiance to the new Pope. Brilliant embassies had also been sent by the Republic of Venice and by Cosimo I.⁴ The repre-

sarelli wrongly gives March 5 as the date of the appointment of Cardinals for the reform of the Dataria, and makes no mention of Cibo. MERKLE, II., 158.

¹ See Acta consist. in GULIK-EUBEL, 34, and Bull. VI., 401 *seq.*

² See the *Capita reformationis, a protocol of the Congregation of Cardinals, in the Cod. Barb. XVI., 42 of the Vatican Library, from which EHSES has made excerpts in the *Pastor Bonus*, XI., 572 *seq.*

³ See MASSARELLI, 162, 179 ; cf. CANCELLIERI, 105.

⁴ Cf. MASSARELLI, 162 *seqq.* See also the report of Masius in LACOMBLET, Archiv., VI., 159 *seq.* The *obedientia* speech of the Florentine ambassador P. Victorius (Vettori) was much admired and was at once printed (Florence 1550) ; cf. MANNI, 120 *seq.*

sentatives of Bologna, where Julius had been Cardinal-Legate, were honoured with special distinction, the Pope saying to them that Julius II. had granted the city many favours, but that the third Julius would do still more for it.¹ On May 4th a brief did actually reduce the three years' subsidy, which the city had to pay, by half the amount.²

Ottavio Farnese had already made his entry into Rome on April 23rd ; he could, however, only take his oath of fealty on May 21st, as the Pope was suffering from a bad cold at the end of April, and was soon afterwards seized by an attack of his old enemy, gout. Nevertheless he devoted himself to business affairs, and took part, though only seated, in the procession of Corpus Christi.³ In consequence of the increasing crowds of those seeking an audience, and the early setting in of the hot weather, Julius had, since June, frequently withdrawn into the cool Belvedere in the Vatican. The removal to Viterbo which had been at first planned for the summer, had to be abandoned owing to the scarcity of funds, which was partly a consequence of the excessive liberality of the Pope.⁴

¹ *Se Giulio II. fece molte gratie a qualla città, state sicuri che Giulio III. ne fara delle molto maggiori. Report of the Bolognese ambassadors of February 10, 1550 (State Archives, Bologna).

² *Brevia Iulii III. in Arm. 41, t. 56, n. 404 ; cf. *ibid.*, n. 430 the *brief of May 10, 1550 (Secret Archives of the Vatican).

³ See MASSARELLI, 169 *seqq.*, 173, 176. Concerning the illness of the Pope, from which he only recovered at the end of May, and his zeal for business, ample details are given by Girol. Biagio in his *letters of April 30, May 7, 14, and 24, 1550 (State Archives, Bologna). Cf. also the *letters of Serristori of May 7, 11, and 30, 1550 (State Archives, Florence).

⁴ See MASSARELLI, 177, 180 *seqq.*, and the *reports of Serristori of July 26 (*La gita di S.B. a Viterbo si tien per esclusa per questo anno poichè saria necessaria una spesa almen di 10,000 scudi, siche Monte, Perugia et Viterbo si riducono a Belvedere solo, dove in vero s'intende et si conosce che farà la sua stanza S.Stà tutta l'estate et parte dell' inverno) and of August 1, 1550 (State Archives, Florence). On October 10, 1550 Buonanni

Only in the autumn did he make several excursions to the Campagna, which is so full of charm at this season. The health of the Pope at this time left a good deal to be desired, but in spite of his sixty-three years, he recovered from the attacks of gout which frequently seized him, in an astonishingly short time.¹ The Romans therefore hoped that the prediction of an astrologer, who prophesied a twenty years' pontificate for the new Pope, might be verified.²

The people of Rome were full of gratitude for the measures which Julius III. adopted to cope with the scarcity of provisions with which the city was threatened, owing to the great influx of pilgrims and the failure of the crops.³ The Pope took steps in all directions to secure so great an importation of corn, as to be really wonderful for those days. To effect this, he wrote among others to the Emperor and to Henry II. of France,⁴ and succeeded in inducing them to give permission for the exportation of corn from Spain

announces: “*Torno hier S.St^a dalla Magliona, della qual non si satisfice punto perchè il suo Belvedere le ha tolto il gusto. Voleva andar attorno 8 o 10 giorni, ma perchè il suo maiordomo le protesto non essersi dinari di andar in volta se ne torno a dietro.”

¹ Cf. the *report of Serristori of September 27, 1550 (State Arch. Florence).

² A *letter of Serristori of March 22, 1550 (State Archives, Florence).

³ The commissary appointed by Paul III. for the Campagna, who had to look after the increase in the price of corn, had his office confirmed as early as July 1, 1550, and extended to the Patrimonium, Corneto and Civitavecchia (see Brevia Arm. 41, t. 57, n. 604: Iulio Bosio). In the letter it says: “*Nos, qui nihil magis curae habuimus nec etiam habemus quam ut annonae vilitas semper et presertim hoc Iubilei anno in terris nostris vigeat.” (Secret Archives of the Vatican).

⁴ See the *briefs of August 2, 1550. Brevia Arm. 41, t. 57, n. 725, 726. Cf. *ibid.* n. 759 the *brief to the viceroy of Naples with the request for the exportation of 6,000 “salmae frumenti” (Secret Archives of the Vatican).

and Provence.¹ Julius III. was also zealously engaged, in the following years, in providing for the material well-being of his capital.²

It is characteristic of the time that any pretext was seized upon for the arrangement of festivals. The arrival of a large quantity of grain procured by the Commissary-General, Leonardo Boccacio, in December, 1550, developed into a brilliant triumphal procession, which was much talked of.³ The festivities of the Romans at the election celebrations of

¹ See the *briefs for Iac. et Bened. Nigrone of September 9 and mercatoribus Parmensibus of October 12 concerning the exportation from Spain, and for Laurent. Cenamo mercatori of November 16 with regard to Provence. *Brevia Arm.* 41, t. 57, n. 759, 800, 887, 954. *Ibid.* n. 986 Magistro Rhodi, to further the exportation of corn from the east to Rome, dated December 1, 1550. (Secret Archives of the Vatican).

² See **Brevia* 1551 *Arm.* 41, t. 59, n. 35: **Duci Florentiae* dated January 25; n. 57: **Viceregi Siciliae*, dated January 31; n. 59: **Viceregi Neapol.*, dated February 1; n. 79: **Ascanio Malatesta*, dated February 18; n. 80: **Reginae Bohemiae gubernatrici Hisp.*, dated February 18; n. 150: **Duci et gubernat. Genuens.*, dated March 11; n. 154: **Gubernatori Messinae*, dated March 11; n. 168: **Viceregi Siciliae*, dated March 14; n. 192: **Franc. Albertino*, dated March 20. In the *Brevia* 1551 t. 61 there also belong to this place: n. 718: **Regi Romanorum*, dated August 22; n. 737; **Duci Sabaudiae* and *Marchionissae Montisferrati*, dated August 27 (Secret Archives of the Vatican). See also the statements in MASSARELLI, 181, 183, 204 *seqq.*; RAYNALDUS, 1551, n. 75; BENIGNI, 33 *seq.*; PFEIFFER-RULAND, *Pestilentia in nummis*, 17, 183; MERKLE, I., ci; DE CUPIS, 142.

³ See *L'ordine della festa con la felice entrata et il gran trionfo fatto per la venuta dei grani fatti venir per terra di luoghi assai lontani dal magnifico signor Leonardo Boccaccio commiss. gener. di N.S. Papa Giulio III. et della santa abundantia de l'alma città di Roma prefetto dignissimo. Sotto li X. di Gennaro MDLI. Roma 1551.* Rare pamphlet; a copy in the State Archives, Munich. Cf. **Diario di Cola Coleine* (Chigi Library) and the **report of Buonanni of December 23, 1550 (State Archives, Florence).

Julius III.¹ as well as the unbridled extravagances of the Carnival,² and the pomp of the life of the court, had shown that the worldly tendencies of the Renaissance period and the preponderance of reminiscences of pagan times were by no means overcome. The journals of Massarelli and others give a vivid picture of the doings of those days, which in many respects remind us of the time of Leo X.

At the festival processions on the anniversary of the Pope's election, the figures of pagan gods were to be seen on the state coaches,³ while mythological figures and emblems⁴ also frequently appeared on the medals of Julius III., even when these were intended to commemorate purely religious events.⁵ Things went particularly far at the Carnival, for the celebration of which Julius had given complete freedom. Races on the Corso alternated with bull-fights and other amusements, at which the Pope did not disdain to assist.⁶ He was also present at the theatrical representations with which the festivities closed, while women were also invited to the Vatican. Massarelli tells us of a feast which the Pope gave on Carnival Tuesday to the ladies of his family in the Hall of Constantine.⁷ From the reports of the envoys and also from other sources it is clear that the Pope, regardless of the gravity of the times, continued to follow, in this respect, the path on which his predecessors of the Renaissance had entered.

Julius III., who, although devoted to business, had always

¹ Cf. CANCELLIERI, Possessi, 504; CLEMENTI, 206 seq.

² RODOCANACHI (Juifs, 209) mentions a *Bando* against the abuses during the Carnival. Cf. concerning these the *report of Ippolito Capilupi to the Duchess of Mantua, dated Rome, February 14, 1551 (Gonzaga Archives, Mantua).

³ See the *Diarium* in MACSWINEY, Portugal, III., 226 n. Cf. CLEMENTI, 209.

⁴ Cf. MUNTZ, III., 119.

⁵ A. Cesati engraved two prisoners on the medal for the Holy Year, because the ancients set such at liberty at their jubilee celebrations. See VASARI, V., 386.

⁶ MASSARELLI, 213. Cola Coleine in CLEMENTI, 209 seq.

⁷ MASSARELLI, 214.

had a great love of pleasure, was specially fond of magnificent banquets. He very frequently invited the Cardinals to sumptuous feasts in the Vatican; he also very willingly accepted invitations himself, and very often did not return home after an evening passed in festivity, but spent the night at the house of his host.¹ Only two Cardinals were absent from these festivities, Carafa and de Cupis, the representatives of the strict reform party, who had made it a rule never to dine out of their own houses.² This was a dumb but eloquent protest against the unbounded luxury displayed by the others on such occasions.³

As Julius III. followed the chase,⁴ gambled with friendly Cardinals and other intimates for large sums,⁵ and kept,

¹ Besides the numerous statements in MASSARELLI, 155 *seqq.* the **reports of Buonanni of July 30 and August 9 and 14, 1550 (S.Stà è hora a S. Marco et in poco spazio di tempo quando a Araceli et quando a S. Pietro in vincula), are also of interest (State Archives, Florence).

² *Report of Ipp. Capilupi, dated Rome, February 3, 1551: "Con S.Stà disenarono tutti i cardinali che sono in Roma da quattuor infuori cioè Trani et Chieti, che non mangiano mai fuor di casa, et Salviati et Gaddi," who are ill. (Gonzaga Archives, Mantua).

³ Cf. in Appendix No. 11 the *report of Serristori of January 31, 1551 (State Archives, Florence).

⁴ Cf. MASSARELLI, 190, 193, 196.

⁵ How fond the Pope was of playing for high stakes, especially at the favourite *primiera* (cf. RODOCANACHI, Rome, 60), is shown even more clearly than in the *reports of Buonanni of October 8, 1550, and of *Serristori of June 24, 1552 (S.Stà vinse a tre dadi 1500 scudi al card. S. Agnolo. State Archives, Florence) by the action brought against Aless. Pallantieri in the time of Paul IV., on account of his alleged unfaithful administration of the Annona. On March 22, 1558, the accused spoke as follows before the attorney of the exchequer, Sebastiano Atracino: Al tempo di papa Giulio, e Sua Santità e i cardinali e i vescovi e tutta la corte vignava, fui messo in ballo ancora io a giocare insieme agli altri, e Sua Santità mi mandava a domandare quasi ogni di, perchè io andassi a giuocare, e far le altre volte, essendo io

numerous court jesters,¹ he also had no scruples about witnessing unseemly theatrical representations. On the 24th of November, 1550, the *Menaechmi* of Plautus was played before

andato alla vigna di Sua Santità a dolermi di certe cose che faceva il signor Ascanio Colonna per impedire che la grascia venisse a Roma, Sua Santità non mi rispose niente a questo, se non che: "siate il benvenuto! a punto ci mancava il quarto!" E dicendogli io che Sua Santità mi aveva dato un peso sulle spalle, il peso cioè dell'abbondanza, e chi bisognava attendere ad altro che a giuocare, Sua Santità mi replicò: "Mi meraviglio di voi; manca grano in Campo di Fiore; restate qui a magnare con Michelangelo, che vi manderò qualche cosa di buono!" E un'altra volta avendomi fatto chiamare in palazzo per giuocare e dicendo io: "Padre Santo, io ho da fare; ho vinto certi scudi non vorria perderli," Sua Santità disse: "bisogna giuocare benchè tu perda non importa; io t'insegnerò a trovare qualche cosa da rubare per te e per me." E così giuocai molte volte e con Sua Santità e in presenza sua a primiera. Il signor Baldoino, suo fratello, non faceva mai altro dopo pranzo che questo, e io ero quasi sempre delli chiamati, e li e quando andavo a qualche banchetto, dove io giuocava con Sua Eccellenza e con cardinali e con altri prelati, e la sorte mia buona volle che là e in casa di monsignor di Pavia, che era governatore, io vincessi parecchie migliaia di scudi, come sa tutta Roma, e mi ricordo che l'ultima volta quando morì il papa, primo di tre o quattro di, giuocando in camera del sig. Baldoino io vinsi al vescovo di Pavia circa due mila scudi ad un giuoco che si dice chi non ha niente. Papa Giulio, per la causa di Vincenzo Spada, mi fece donare in un sachetto mille scudi d'oro e per certa altra causa circa cinquecento scudi, e con questi e con altri guadagni io ho comprato questi uffizi et questa casa e fabbricatola. . . . Mi scordavo di dire che il papa fece giuocare spesse volte il vescovo di Ascoli, che era governatore, si come il vescovo di Pavia, che era governatore. . . . State Archives, Rome, Proc. tom. 36, communicated by BRUZZONE in the Turin newspaper *La Stampa*, 1900, n. 51; this being very difficult to obtain, it has been thought useful to print the extract in full.

¹ Expenditure for *Buffoni* is often to be met with in the *account books of Julius III. (State Archives, Rome); see several examples in *ERULEI*, 17.

the Pope in the Castle of St. Angelo, and a few days later Ariosto's *Cassaria*, and on January 22nd, 1551, the *Eunuchus* of Plautus, which had been translated into Italian.¹

Julius III. permitted comedies to be performed in the Belvedere, especially during Carnival time, and on February 3rd, 1551, the *Aulularia* of Plautus was given in the presence of the Pope and twenty-four Cardinals. The Mantuan correspondent praises the beauty of the staging and the excellence of the music, which had given great pleasure to everyone.² A comedy which was also given in the Belvedere a short time afterwards, on the occasion of the anniversary of the election of Julius, was, on the contrary, a complete fiasco. As usual all the Cardinals were invited, as well as the ambassadors of France, Portugal, and Venice. This piece, composed by a native of Siena, was extremely silly and rather unseemly, and it was only the presence of the Pope which prevented it from being hissed. Julius showed his displeasure by pretending to fall asleep; at the end he remarked that the dramatist should be excused, since he was a Siennese. On the same evening fifty Roman nobles in magnificent antique costumes set up a carrousel in St. Peter's Square, which gave great satisfaction. On the following day there was a bull-fight, at which the Pope and many Cardinals were present;³ comedies were performed in the Vatican in the very last year of the reign of Julius III.⁴ No one, however, seems to have realized how very unecclesiastical all this was.⁵

¹ MASSARELLI, 202. BERTOLOTTI, *Artisti Veneti*, 54. Art. Bolognesi, Bologna 1885, 37 *seq.* ERULEI, 19. Cf. the *report of Ipp. Capilupi of January 26, 1551, *Gonzaga Archives, Mantua). Buonanni tells of a performance of the *Cassaria* in a **report of December, 1, 1550 (State Archives, Florence).

² See in Appendix No. 12 the *report of Ipp. Capilupi of February 3, 1551 (Gonzaga Archives, Mantua). Cf. MASSARELLI, 213.

³ See besides MASSARELLI, 214 in Appendix No. 13 the *report of Ipp. Capilupi of February 14, 1551 (Gonzaga Archives, Mantua).

⁴ See ANCEL in the Rev. Bénédict, XXV., 50.

⁵ Expenditure for the performance of comedies in the years 1552 and 1555 in ERULEI, 19.

The pernicious tradition of the Renaissance Popes was also repeatedly followed by Julius III. in the promotion of his relatives.¹ At first he resisted² their urgent solicitations for offices similar to those filled by the Farnese family under Paul III., but his opposition weakened only too quickly. He did not, however, go as far as his predecessor; he gave his relatives no principalities, nor did they enjoy any great political influence. As the general feeling and circumstances of the time were unfavourable, there was no wholesale nepotism in this reign, and the relatives of the Pope, who crowded in vain round his deathbed,³ urging their demands, were by no means satisfied, though they had considerable reason to be so.⁴

At the beginning of his reign, the Pope had promoted the interests of two relatives at the distribution of the offices in the Curia. One of these, Pietro del Monte, he appointed governor of the Castle of St. Angelo, while he bestowed on his sister's son, Ascanio della Corgna, a clever soldier, the command of his guard.⁵ The Pope had always loved his elder brother,

¹ Cf. concerning this, especially DANDOLO, 354 *seqq.*, and DE LEVA, V., 114 *seq.*

² On February 23, 1550, Buonanni reports: *Sino a qui non mostra S.^{ta} animo di volere levare alcuno dei carichi, che desse la s. m. di Paolo, il che preme assai a questi parenti di Iulio et ne mostrano mala contentezza (State Archives, Florence).

³ Nonciat. de France, I., xlv., n. 4.

⁴ His proneness to nepotism also brought Julius III., into conflict with the election capitulation (see Quellen und Forschungen des Preuss. Histor. Instituts, XII., 224 *seq.*), concerning the alteration of which deliberations were held as early as May 30, and again on June 13, 1550. See MASSARELLI, 177.

⁵ See MASSARELLI, 153 and PAGLIUCCHI, 121 *seq.* Ascanio had "200 scudi di provisione." Buonanni, who announces this on February 23, 1550, adds: "La cavalleria che si trova nello stato eccles^{co} si cassera et si ridurra a 200 cavalli, che staran qui. I Suizzeri, che son 200, non credo che s'accresceranno (State Archives, Florence). On December 18, 1550, Asc. della Corgna became "gubernator perpetuus" of the "Castrum

"Messer Baldovino," as the ambassadors always called him. Baldovino, who was already in Rome on February 24th, 1550, received the Borgia Apartments as a lodging,¹ and later on the Palazzo dell' Aquila in St. Peter's Square.² The dignity of Cardinal, however, was not bestowed upon him, the Pope considering him too old and otherwise unsuited.³ He appointed him Governor of Spoleto on March 20th, 1550, investing him with rich revenues later on, and also giving him Camerino, for his life-time.⁴ Besides all this, Julius obtained for him from Cosimo de' Medici, as early as July, 1550, the

Plebis" (see *Brief to him [ut status quoque nobis sanguine intime coniuncti conditionem decentius tenere valeas.] *Brevia Arm.* 41, t. 58, n. 1022. Secret Archives of the Vatican) Cf. concerning A. della Corgna, the Nonciat. de France I 24.

¹ See MASSARELLI, 157, 183.

² See EHRLE, Bufalini, 15.

³ Cf. Legaz. di Serristori, 243 *seq.* Here the *letter of Serristori of April 17, 1550, is wanting, in which he says: *Al s. Baldovino disse che provederebbe di stato conveniente a lui non disegnando a modo alcuno di farlo cardinale per esse oltre con l'età et perchè non havesse a mettersi a imperar a dir l'offitio et l'introito come intervenne a Pucci in sua vecchiezza (State Archives, Florence). Cf. in the same place the *report of Buonanni of March 16, 1550.

⁴ By the *brief of March 20, 1550, he separated Spoleto from Umbria and appointed Baldovino, "quo nec sanguinis coniunctionem nec in amore magis praecipuum habemus et huic regimini valde idoneum et utile fore speramus," as his deputy and in the city and district of Spoleto, and as "castellanus arcis." *Brevia Arm.* 41, t. 55, n. 202. *Ibid.* t. 56, n. 731 the *brief to Baldovino of August 4, 1550: After having appointed you Collector-General of the revenues of Camerino, we present you with the same, "considerantes congruum esse, ut tibi, qui germanus frater noster existis, unde iuxta convenientiam gradus et conditionis tuae, presertim apud Nos et in servitiis nostris existendo decenter sustentari valeas, per Nos provideatur" (Secret Archives of the Vatican). Cf. also *Serristori's reports of July 26, August 19 and 30, 1550 (State Archives, Florence) and TESORONI, 35. Concerning Camerino, cf. LILLI, Storia di Camerino, 359.

newly founded lordship of Monte San Savino, in feudal tenure.¹

Baldovino had, by his marriage with Giulia Mancini, two daughters,² as well as three sons. Of the latter, only one, Giovan Battista, was still alive. Julius entrusted this nephew with the government of Fermo and Nepi, and appointed him Standard-Bearer of the Church.³ When Giovan Battista del Monte, whose whole mind was fixed on the pursuit of arms, fell on April 14th, 1552, at the siege of Mirandola,⁴ the Pope entrusted the government of the two said towns to Baldovino.⁵

¹ Cf. SALVADORI in the *Rassegna Settimanale*, VI., n. 132 and TESORONI, 34.

² Orsula and Cristina. They received, like the other relations, monthly revenues. See *Intr. et Exit. 1554-1555 in the Cod. Vat. 10605 of the Vatican Library.

³ Cf. The *reports of Serristori of July 26 (*N.S. dette il governo di Fermo a beneplacito al s. Giov. Battista) and August 30, 1550 (bestowal of Nepi). State Archives, Florence. See also Legaz. di Serristori, 244, 257; DE LEVA, V., 116 and *Histor. Zeitschrift*, XXIX., 316. The interest the Pope took in his nephew was shown when the latter fell ill in 1551. The Duke of Ferrara sent his physician to him at that time; Julius III. begged him to give him an exact account of the course of the illness. See brief for Ant. Brasaulae medico of August 9, 1551 (Arm. 4I, t. 6I, n. 673. Secret Arch. of the Vatican).

⁴ Cf. BALAN, *Mirandola*, 45 *seq.*

⁵ See the *briefs to Baldovino of April 29 and May 6, 1552 (Arm. 4I, t. 64, n. 275 and 298). The *letter of thanks to Duke Ercole of Ferrara for his condolences, on April 25, 1552, sounds very resigned (We always endeavour to submit to the Divine Will, "ut omnia quae nobis eveniunt, sive prospera sive illa sint adversa, ad nostram eruditionem et inscrutabili Dei iudicio provenire existimemus) and to the Viceroy of Naples on the same day (non ignorantes, humanam naturam et res bellicas, quas ipse noster nepos sua electione, non. nostra voluntate sequebatur, huiusmodi saepe casus parere consuevisse.") Arm. 4I, t. 64, n. 265 and 266 (Secret Archives of the Vatican). The weight of this loss is emphasised by Serristori in an interesting *letter of March 23, 1552 (State Archives, Florence). Baldovino died in August, 1556; see *letter of Navagero of August 22, 1556 (Library of St. Mark's, Venice).

Baldovino's natural son, Fabiano, had already been legitimized at the beginning of the reign, and though he was only a child, the household of a prince was now bestowed on him. As Giovan Battista had left no children, the hopes of the family had been centred, even before Giovan's untimely death, on Fabiano.¹ Cosimo de' Medici, who was extremely anxious to attach the Pope to himself, gave his daughter Lucrezia, in 1554, after long negotiations, to this nephew in marriage. The Pope joyfully agreed, but was most careful to withhold any political significance from this marriage, to the great disgust of the Medici.²

Of the two sisters of the Pope, the younger, Jacopa, married to Francia della Corgna, had two sons, Ascanio, already mentioned, and Fulvio, who was first made Bishop of Perugia, and then became Cardinal, in December, 1551.³ Roberto, the son of Ludovica, the elder sister of the Pope, and married to Roberto de' Nobili, also became a Cardinal. This Roberto was a youth of such a holy disposition, that it could be said of him that he was an example of that childlike piety in which heaven is reflected on earth.⁴

The inconsistencies of Julius III. are shown in nothing so much as in the fact that he bestowed the Cardinal's hat on another youth, who was as vicious as Roberto de' Nobili was virtuous.

The Venetian ambassador Dandolo relates how Julius III., when he was legate in Piacenza, took a boy of low extraction, from the streets, as it were, and made him keeper of his ape, because he had shown great courage when the animal caught

¹ Cf. MASSARELLI, 161 and DE LEVA, V., 115. The legitimatization of Fabiano in TESORONI, 81 *seq.*

² Cf. Legaz. di Serristori, 302 *seq.*, 309 *seq.*, 332 *seq.*; FIRMANUS, 502-503; *Brief to Cosimo of April, 11, 1554 ("Mirifice gaudemus" at the conclusion of the family alliance. Arm. 41, t. 70, n. 199. Secret Archives of the Vatican); Nonciat. de France, I., xliv., 26; PALLAVICINI, 13, 10, 8; TESORONI, 84 *seq.*

³ See MASSARELLI, 158 and Nonciat. de France, I., 62.

⁴ See REUMONT, III., 2, 505; cf. CIACONIUS, III., 784 *seqq.*, and *infra* chap.

hold of him. The keeper of the ape learned in a short time how to insinuate himself into the favour of his master, to such an extent, that the latter grew fond of him and prevailed upon his brother to adopt him. To the name of Innocenzo del Monte, which he now bore, he brought nothing but dishonour.¹ In spite of this he received a provostship in Arezzo, for the Cardinal clung to him with a love which was as inexplicable as it was incredible. Massarelli, who testifies to this, adds: "As soon as Giovan Maria del Monte became Pope, nothing was nearer to his heart and intentions than to raise his brother's adopted son to the highest dignities and to heap upon him honours and riches. Up till now—three months have passed—he has given him an income of 12,000 crowns, and has at last elevated him, with the greatest satisfaction, to the high dignity of Cardinal."²

There was no want of opposition to this shameful abuse of Papal power; Cardinal Pole reminded the Pope of the canonical decrees and the gravity of the times,³ while Carafa made still more urgent remonstrances. As he had had, for a long

¹ See DANDOLO, 355 and MERKLE, I., 177; MASSARELLI, 174 *seq.*; Masius in LACOMBLET, Archiv, VI., 163; CIACONIUS, III., 759; Arch. stor. Ital., Ser. 4, XIII., 420. Cf. PALLAVICINI, II, 7, 4 and the deservedly sharp criticism of RAYNALDUS, (1550. n. 50). GRIMM (Michelangelo, II., 423) makes Innocenzo the son of Julius III. without any proof whatever.

² MASSARELLI, 175. Buonanni announces the impending appointment of Innocenzo as Cardinal as early as February 23 (see Appendix No. 4). Cf. the report of Dandolo of March 16 in DE LEVA, V., 117. On April 17, 1550, Serristori says: *Disse S.Stà al Buonanni che al primo o secondo consistorio al più lungo voleva crear cardinale il proposto, suo nepote et che su questo principio harebbe 13,000 scudi d'entrata. Cf. Buonanni's *report of April 18, 1550. On April 30 Serristori announces: *S.Stà mando per il proposto, il qual se ne verrà a Bagnaia, where the red hat was sent to him. (State Arch. Florence).

³ See *dispatch of Dandolo of April 18, 1550 (State Archives, Venice), in part in DE LEVA, V., 118; cf. DRUFFEL, I., 398; BROWN, n. 662.

time, close and friendly relations with Julius III., he hoped to be able to prevent the nomination. The old Cardinal, therefore, did everything that lay in his power; he went personally to the Pope and explained to him with all the powers of his eloquence, the reasons which should prevent him from taking such an unfortunate step. He represented the shame which would attach to the perpetrator of such a deed, the talk of the people, which should be avoided, above all by a prince, as well as the evil suppositions to which the elevation of a fatherless and vicious young man would give rise.¹ It was all in vain. On May 30th, 1550, Julius III., in a secret consistory, elevated the seventeen year old Innocenzo del Monte to the cardinalate. On July 1st the latter made his solemn entry into Rome, and on the following day he received, not in public, as was customary, but again in a secret consistory, the red hat.² Cardinal Carafa kept away from both consistories, in order not to have even the appearance of approving by his silent presence this unhappy incident. Instead of doing so, he wrote a letter to the Pope, in which he once more expressly declared that he would not agree to such a nomination.³

What Carafa and many others⁴ had foreseen, was verified only too soon. The nomination gave the greatest scandal, and far and wide Julius was declared to be the father of Innocenzo; indeed, the accusation was by no means the worst of the crimes of which his enemies at once pronounced him guilty. The accusation, however, of the gravest immorality has never been proved against him, either at that

¹ See *Apologia alla relat. del Navagero (National Library, Naples; cf. Appendix Nos. 61, 62). BROMATO, II., 158 seq.

² See Acta consist. in GULIK-EUBEL, 35; MASSARELLI, 174-175; the reports in DRUFFEL, I., 406; DE LEVA, V., 118 seq.; Arch. d. miss. scientif., Ser. 2, V., 98.

³ BROMATO, II., 159. The *Apologia mentioned *supra* n. 1, says that copies of the letter of Carafa were circulated everywhere.

⁴ Cf. in Appendix No. 4 the *report of Buonanni of February 23, 1550 (State Archives, Florence).

time or afterwards. Julius himself was to blame that such an idea should have arisen and been believed, as his attitude towards Innocenzo del Monte must have given rise to the gravest suspicions, especially at a time of such unbridled license.¹

Julius III. hoped against all hope that Cardinal Innocenzo would lead a life in accordance with his dignity.² The upstart, however, only made more insolent by his unexpected good fortune, gave himself up, even more than before, to a perfectly scandalous life. He not only received rich benefices, such as the abbey of St. Michael in Normandy and that of

¹ It is well known how prevalent it was in the time of the Renaissance to affix the stigma of perversity to one's enemies. This mode of attack was still being carried on (see especially the lampoon against Card. del Monte in the *Giorn. stor. della lett. Ital.*, XLIII., 242 *seq.*), and even Panvinio allowed himself to be led into making such implications against Julius III. (*puerorum amoribus implicitus*). See MERKLE, II., 147; *cf.* CXXXIV. Had there been any proof for this accusation Sarpi would not have failed to have put it forward. The accusation of the reformers is therefore justly repudiated (see Röse in ERSCH-GRUBER, 2, section XXVIII., 351; ASCHBACH, *Kirchenlexicon*, III., 656, and BRUZZONE, *La vigna di papa Giulio*: *Messaggero*, 1911, n. 51). CIACONIUS (III., 759) has already shown that the inscription in the Villa Giulia does not prove that Innocenzo del Monte was a son of Julius III.

² *Cf.* the *brief to the Doge of Venice of June 21, 1550: Your letter concerning the elevation of Cardinal Innocenzo del Monte and the speech of your ambassador have informed us of your good will. "Nos quidem, f. d. (for what is crossed out read "domestice res ac rationes nostre ad id impulerunt") privata quedam ob paucitatem gentilium nostrorum necessitas ad id impulit, speramus tamen aliquem defectum eius aetatis maturitate ingenii ab eo esse supplendum." In any case he will always be for you. *Arm.* 41, t. 56, n. 568. *Ibid.* t. 63, n. 117 a *Brief of February 20, 1552, in which Julius III. thanks the Doge for having bestowed the freedom of the city on his brother and the latter's sons (Secret Archives of the Vatican).

St. Zeno in Verona,¹ as well as the legation of Bologna, in June, 1552² but also a position similar to that which Cardinal Alessandro Farnese had enjoyed under Paul III. At the end of November, 1551, the nuncios were requested to address their letters in future to Cardinal Innocenzo del Monte, instead of, as formerly, to the first Secretary of State, Girolamo Dandino, or to the Pope himself. This change was due to Baldovino, who gave his brother this fatal advice.³ Innocenzo del Monte, who did not possess the slightest aspiration towards a higher life, had neither the wish nor the capacity to devote himself to business; his activities as secretary of state consisted in affixing his signature to the dispatches drawn up in his name, and in pocketing the revenues of his high office.

The direction of affairs lay in the hands of the Pope, of his brother Baldovino, and of the experienced secretary of state, Girolamo Dandino.⁴ Dandino had been trained in the chancery of Paul III., which was a good school, and had become intimately acquainted with the position of affairs in France and Germany, through numerous diplomatic missions.⁵

¹ *Serristori announces the conveyance of the abbey S. Michael Rotomag. dioc. by Henry II. (val. 2500 duc.) on July 21, 1550 (State Archives, Florence). Concerning S. Zeno see MASSARELLI, 218. Julius III. also requested a pension for Cardinal del Monte from the Emperor (see DRUFFEL, I., 416). Concerning the bestowal of the bishopric of Mirepoix in the year 1553 see THOMAS, III., 198.

² *Brief to the Forty of Bologna, dated June 4, 1552 (Arm, 41, t. 64, n. 391 Secret Archives of the Vatican). Cf. BELLUZZI, 180.

³ See PIEPER, 122 and Nuntiaturberichte, XII., xxxiii., 107, n. 2. During an absence of Dandino G. Ricci had taken his place; cf. *ibid.*, 55, n. 5.

⁴ See RICHARD in the Rév. d'hist. éccl., XI., 520; cf. Nuntiaturberichte, VIII., 12 *seq.*

⁵ For Dandino cf. DANDOLO, 357; PIEPER, 121; Nuntiaturberichte, VIII., 12-13; Nonciat. de France, I., n. 2. Dandino died in Rome in 1559; his grave is in S. Marcello (see FORCELLA, II., 308). The correspondent of Cosimo I. in Rome, Buonanni, was not pleased with the appointment of Dandino. He writes on

There were three other secretaries besides him, employed as assistants in the chancery : Giulio Canano, Angelo Massarelli, and Trifone Bencio, the latter also having charge of the cypher codes.¹ The office of secretary of Latin letters, which had been filled during the whole reign of Paul III. by Blosius Palladius,² still remained in the hands of this distinguished stylist under Julius III. When Blosius died in August, 1550, Julius divided this lucrative post, which had formerly been filled by two officials. His choice fell on the two able humanists, Galeazzo Florimonte, Bishop of Aquino, and Romolo Amaseo, of Bologna, who was recommended by Cardinal Alessandro Farnese. After the death of Amaseo, in the summer of 1552, the eminent Bishop of Carpentras, Paolo Sadoletto, took his place.³

March 21, 1550 : *Parse buona la resolutione che presse S.Stà di non servirsi del Cavalcante per quel ch'el conclave fini di chiarirlo. Ma il continuare di servirsi del Dandino et di lassargli la sottoscrizione in mano, non e lodato da alcuno, massime da chi sa l'inclinatione di detto Dandino al servitio del Rè, quel ch'egli rivelò al car^{al} di Ferrara dei negocii secreti di Paulo et i dinari et la pensione c'hebbe sotto mano da S.S. ill^{ma} et rev^{ma}. (State Archives, Florence).

¹ MASSARELLI, 154. PIEPER, 121 *seq.* Nonciat. de France, I., 72, n. 2.

² See Vol. XII. of this work, p. 539. Cf. concerning Blosius, MAFFEI in the *Rassegna per la storia di Volterra*, I. (1898), 8 *seqq.* 82 *seqq.*

³ See MASSARELLI, 185 ; CARO-FARNESE, *Lettere*, I., 260 ; DRUFFEL, II., 660 ; LAUCHERT, 685 ; GRELLA, G. Florimonte, *S. Maria Sapua Vetera*, 1909 ; the *reports of Buonanni of August 14 and 15, 1550 (State Archives, Florence) and the *letter of Gir. Biagio of August 16, 1550 (State Archives, Bologna). P. Sadoletto had at once welcomed the election of Julius III. in a **letter to Card. Farnese dated Carpent. IV., Id. April 1550 (Vat. 4103, p. 107 *seq.* Vatican Library). The *brief of his appointment, dated July 25, 1552, in Min. brev. 65, n. 519 (Secret Archives of the Vatican). In the last year of the reign of Julius III. there appeared in the *Intr. et Exit. (Cod. Vat. 10605) payments (70 sc. per mese) for the following four *secretarii* :

Dandino, whom Julius justly valued highly, was the real head of the Chancery. When he became Cardinal on November 20th, 1551, he bequeathed his official duties to his secretary, the talented Canano. These two conducted the correspondence with the nuncios, while Cardinal Innocenzo del Monte enjoyed the advantages and honours of the office, although he only wrote the signatures.¹ The Pope superintended ecclesiastical as well as political affairs; he had taken up an independent attitude from the beginning and hardly ever consulted with anyone.² The zeal with which Julius III. devoted himself to business, especially in the first years of his reign, is proved by the fact that in the case of important official documents, he not only suggested the matter himself, but also the form in which it should be expressed. Even though these documents are not headed "Dictated by the Pope himself," they can nevertheless easily be distinguished from others; they bear a stamp which is quite their own and surprise as much by their vigour and wealth of imagery, as by the striking originality of their mode of expression.³ The

Canano, Massarelli, Sadoletto, and Bencio; Cesare Grolerio appears here specially for briefs; he had been a secretary since 1552. See ANCEL, *Secrét. pontif.*, 51.

¹ Cf. PIEPER, 123; RICHARD, *loc. cit.*; TÖRNE, P. Gallio card. de Come, Paris, 1907, 38. Concerning the lasting influence of Dandino, see not only Masius, LACOMBLET, *Archiv*, V., 195 and LOSSEN, 123) but also Serristori in his *letters of May, 29, 1551 (Dandino is the "spirito di S.Stà et carissimo al s. Baldo-vino") and February 15, 1553. (State Archives, Florence).

² Cf. DANDOLO, 357; Legaz. di Serristori, 276, 278; Mendoza in DÖLLINGER, I., 189.

³ PIEPER brings this into special prominence (pp. 123-124). *Ibid.* (pp. 124-129), see exact account of the instructions of Julius III., which are to be found in almost all European libraries, and (pp. 129-139) concerning his diplomatic correspondence. Cf. also Nonciat. de France, I., iv. *seq.* concerning the supplements in the "Fonds Borghese" to which KUPKE had already drawn attention in the *Histor. Vierteljahrsschrift*, 1898, I., 143; see also KUPKE's preface to the XIIth Volume of the *Nuntiaturberichte*. Concerning the "Archivio Dandini" in the Secret

journal of Massarelli testifies to the great assiduity with which the Pope prepared and worked out the instructions for his nuncios.¹ The Pope's very confidential friends, Cardinal Crescenzi² and Angelo Massarelli, as well as Dandino, were called upon to assist in this work. Massarelli was, however, specially chosen on account of his experience in the question of the Council.

Archives of the Vatican, see also WIRZ, Akten, xl. *seq.* and Bullen, L.; *cf. ibid.*, xxvi. concerning the Brief Register of Julius III. The Regesta of the Pope are inventoried in PALMIERI, 82 *seq.*, the Ruoli in ANCEL, Secrét. pontif., 49.

¹ See MASSARELLI, 177, 179, 182.

² *Cf.* DANDOLO, 357; MASSARELLI *passim*. Buonanni speaks very badly of Crescenzi. He reports on July 7, 1550: *Di qua va lunghissima ogni espeditione poiche S.Stà cedendo pochi negocii gli remette tutti a Crescentio, che per natura et accidente va cosi tardo nelle espeditioni ch'è uno stento il cavargliene una delle mani. He again complains on July 19 of the "longhezze" of Crescenzi. On August 9 he reports: *S.Stà non puo star senza lui [Crescenzi] et quand' è seco devon trattar d'ogni altra cosa che de negocii perchè di nessun si sentono espeditioni. **Buonanni emphasizes Crescenzi's influence on October 7, 1550 (State Archives, Florence). Besides Crescenzi Cardinal Maffei was much favoured by the Pope; see CARO-FARNESE, I., 133, and Masius in LACOMBLET, Archiv, VI., 157.

CHAPTER III.

PREPARATIONS FOR THE REASSEMBLING OF THE COUNCIL IN TRENT.—THE DISPUTE CONCERNING THE DUCHY OF PARMA.

AMONG the points of the election capitulation to which Julius III. had pledged himself in the conclave, the re-opening of the General Council for the extirpation of heresy and the reform of the Church stood in the first place. For the promotion of this matter the Pope had entered upon diplomatic negotiations with Charles V. and Henry II. immediately after he ascended the throne.¹

Even before Pedro de Toledo, the appointed envoy to the Emperor, entered upon his mission, well-informed people believed that the Head of the Church was prepared, not only to continue the Council in Trent but, under certain circumstances, even in another place, in the centre of Germany; it was, however, to be a real and free Council.² Toledo, indeed, declared by word of mouth, that he believed His Holiness would make such a concession, should he think Trent unsuitable, but only if security should be given him that there should be no undue interference in the matter of reform or of the authority of the Holy See.³

¹ Cf. *supra* p. 55.

² *All' imperatore ha promesso di dare il concilio (ma che sia concilio secondo i canoni et non fatto solo per interesse di S.M^{ta} come voleva fare al tempo di papa Paulo) in mezo 'l corpo dell' Alemagna. *Olivo to S. Calandra, dated Rome, February 15, 1550 (Gonzaga Archives, Mantua). See also the letter of Masius of February 17, 1550, in LACOMBLET, *Archiv*, VI., 156.

³ See Charles V. to Mendoza, translated in MAYNIER, 592 n. with wrong date, May 18 instead of March 18. Cf. MAURENBRECHER, 228.

The Imperialists had not expected such complaisance. Had not Diego de Mendoza been so taken aback at first at del Monte's election that the Pope had to call out to him: "Don't be so terrified, ambassador!"¹ Charles V. was most pleasantly surprised. His answer to Pedro de Toledo was exceedingly gracious; Toledo was to beg the Pope respectfully in his name to summon the Council as soon as possible and to hold it in Trent. With regard to the guarantees required by Julius III. the Emperor assured him that he only wished to promote what was most advantageous to the Apostolic See and agreeable to His Holiness, in so far as this depended on him and was not contrary to his duty.² On March 16th, 1550, Charles V. informed his brother Ferdinand, that he had thought it right at once to inform the Papal ambassador of his agreement with the offer regarding the Council, and that he would now, in order to take the Pope at his word, summon the Imperial Diet for June 25th, at Augsburg.³

Before the arrival of Toledo, Charles V. had already sent his confidant, Luis de Avila, to Rome, to convey his congratulations, bearing a letter in which he assured the Pope of his perfect readiness to protect the Church. Julius III. received the ambassador on March 25th, 1550, and also declared his intention of proceeding in the matter of the Council, as in all else, to the satisfaction of the Emperor.⁴

In April, 1550, the Pope entrusted a commission of seven Cardinals: de Cupis, Carafa, Morone, Crescenzi, Sfondrato, Pole and Cervini with the deliberations concerning the Council, at the same time recalling Sebastiano Pighino from Germany to Rome, for the purpose of furnishing reports. Morone set forth the by no means unimportant difficulties which stood in the way of a renewal of the Council at Trent, and these were carefully considered by the commission. The result was

¹ DANDOLO, 347. DE LEVA, V., 93. BROWN, V., n. 643.

² See the letter to Mendoza cited *supra* p. 77, n. 3.

³ LANZ, III., I *seqq.*

⁴ See RAYNALDUS, 1550, n. 5 and 8; MASSARELLI, 162 *seq.*; DRUFFEL, I., 384.

the approval of the decision to reopen the Council at Trent.¹

As a matter of fact, the two principal objections to the Council being again held in Trent were no longer in existence. The danger of interference on the part of the Council in the Papal election appeared to be over, as the new Head of the Church was no longer, as had been the case with Paul III., a broken old man, but one who was still in possession of great bodily vigour. The other difficulty, which concerned the validity of the removal of the Council to Bologna, which had taken place with the consent of His Holiness, was overcome by the fact that almost all the Spanish bishops had left Trent after the departure of Cardinal Pacheco to the conclave, so that it could hardly be maintained that the assembly was still in existence. It was therefore possible again to take up the work of the Council in Trent, without detriment to the reputation of Julius III. and his predecessor. This was the aim of the election capitulation, of the nuncios in Germany, and also of the Emperor, who was joined by the King of Poland. A continuance of the Council in Bologna was therefore impossible, if only for the reason that in such a case a judgment concerning the suspension, originated by Julius III., as legate, and warmly advocated by him, would have had to be expressed. This would again have given rise to the old disputes and, moreover, the Emperor had only received the consent of the German States for Trent as the seat of the Council.²

¹ Cf. MASSARELLI, 168 *seq.*; the opinion of Morone in RAYNALDUS, 1550, n. 9 and in LE PLAT, IV., 164; Nuntiaturberichte, XII., xxxiv., where, erroneously, only five Cardinals are given; *letter of Serristori of April 24, 1550. Concerning the dispatch of the nuncios Serristori had already reported on February 26: *Al Pighino mi disse S.^{no} che disegnavà dare il carico di Nuntio appre[sso] all' imp^{re}. In Francia disegna di mandare mons^r della Casa, ancora ch'ei mostri non contenta[rsi]. In Portogallo il vescovo Giambeccaro, et in Venetia il Beccatello (State Archives, Florence).

² Cf. the "Discorso mandato in Francia" in PALLAVICINI, II, 8, 4.

Immediately after the decision of the commission the Pope informed the Imperial ambassador Mendoza of his intention to open the Council in Trent and to appoint Pighino as nuncio to Charles V. for the carrying out of the preliminary negotiations. He begged, however, that the matter might not in the meantime be openly discussed ; first, because it had still to be considered in the consistory, and also to prevent the French from having an opportunity of prematurely putting difficulties in the way. The nuncio at the court of the Emperor, Pietro Bertano, also received a corresponding intimation and was enjoined to keep the matter secret for the time being.¹

Now that the agreement between the Pope and the Emperor appeared to guarantee the speedy reopening of the Council, the most dangerous intrigues against it were again being carried on by the French sovereign, as had formerly been the case in the time of Francis I.

The French King acquiesced in the election of Julius III.,² but not in the friendly overtures of the new Pope to the Emperor. The former, indeed, did everything in his power to consider the susceptibilities of France,³ but the French politicians greatly feared the revival of religious unity in Germany through the Council ; they considered it much more advantageous that the religious division and consequent loss of vital power in Germany should continue.⁴

It was in vain, therefore, that Julius III. showed the French

¹ See Mendoza's report in DRUFFEL, I., 393, and the *letter al vescovo di Fano [Bertano] per via di Don Diego, dated Rome, April 25, 1550 (Secret Archives, of the Vatican).

² See Henry's letter to Cosimo I. in DESJARDINS, III., 233 *seq.*

³ *Il card. di Ferrara ha desiderate stanze in palazzo afin che fra tanti imperiali (Alvarez de Toledo and Carpi had received lodgings in the Vatican ; see RIBIER, II., 264) si mostri pur che vi stia un di fazione Franzese et ha ottenute quelle che solea tenere il camerlengo a tempo di Paulo disegnate per il s. Balduino da Iulio. Serristori on March 17, 1550 (State Archives, Florence). The French Cardinals could not gain any influence, as they were very much at variance with one another. See ROMIER, 236 *seq.*

⁴ Cf. RAYNALDUS, 1550, n. 10 ; MAURENBRECHER, 228.

King the most extreme complaisance in an endeavour to break down at least his direct opposition ; nor did it improve matters when the Pope, in his conferences with Cardinals Tournon and d'Este, exerted all his diplomatic skill to remove the objections of the French.¹ The direct negotiations were to be dealt with by Antonio Trivulzio, who was well known and very popular at the French court, and who was destined to succeed the present nuncio, Michele della Torre.² His departure was delayed, however, as well as that of Pighino, in consequence of an attack of gout which seized the Pope, and it was not until the beginning of July, 1550, that the two envoys could at last set out upon their journey.³

Pighino,⁴ who was appointed Archbishop of Siponto, and was to replace Bertano, who had been nuncio till then, received in the instructions prepared for him on June 20th, orders to lay four considerations before the Emperor, not so as to raise impediments, but with a view to getting rid, by a mutual understanding, of certain difficulties which still stood in the way. The first consideration was with regard to the Frenchmen who were destined to take part in the Council of the Church, so that in the endeavour to win back Germany she might not lose France, or the King set up a national

¹ Cf. RIBIER, II., 275 *seq.*

² The *brief recalling M. della Torre dated April 25, 1550, in Arm. 41, t. 55, n. 360 (Secret Archives of the Vatican).

³ See Mendoza in DRUFFEL, I., 401, and MASSARELLI, 181. Cf. *supra* chap. II.

⁴ In DRUFFEL, I., 423 *seqq.* and in LAEMMER, Melet., 156 *seq.* Emendations in the text in PIEPER, 140 *seq.* Cf. Dandolo's report of June 14, 1550, in DE LEVA, V., 101. The Briefs of June 23, given to Pighino, " ad ducem Saxoniae, march. Brandenburg. et comitem Palat. Rheni " in LE PLAT, IV., 165 ; *Brief of June 22, 1550, for the " princ. Hisp." and the German princes with regard to the mission of Pighino in Arm. 41, t. 56, n. 574 (Secret Archives of the Vatican). The departure of Pighino which, according to MASSARELLI, 181, took place on July 2, is announced by *Serristori as having already taken place on July 1, 1550 (State Archives, Florence).

schismatical council. In order to overcome the distrust of the French King for the city of Trent, which was situated in Imperial territory, Julius III. was prepared to promise that the Council should only occupy itself with questions concerning the faith and the reform of morals, but in no way with political matters or with the special privileges accorded to the French kings. The second consideration concerned the poverty of the Apostolic See and of the Italian prelates, in consequence of which it appeared impossible to bear for a long period the expenses entailed by the upkeep of the Council and the residence thereat. In order, therefore, to avoid unnecessary delay, the Emperor was to undertake, as far as lay in his power, that the Council should begin punctually and fulfil its duties expeditiously. In order to do so Charles V. would have to secure the acceptance of the Council by the Catholics as well as the Protestants in the Imperial Diet, because the acquiescence of the Germans had been the principal supposition upon which the commission of Cardinals had consented to hold the Council at Trent. The third consideration related to the dogmatic decisions which had been already fixed at the Council of Trent and at other Councils, and concerning which the Pope insisted, from the Catholic point of view, and with perfect right, that they must not again be called in question. In connection with this the difficult question arose, as to how the Protestants were to be heard should they appear in the Synod. Finally, the fourth consideration was with regard to the supreme authority of the Pope and of the Apostolic See, in the Council and out of it, which was not to be impugned. An appendix to the instructions, which was sent after the nuncio, dealt with the dispute concerning the possession of Piacenza.

The instructions, also drawn up on June 20th, for Trivulzio,¹

¹ In DRUFFEL, I., 434 *seqq.* with wrong date, omissions and errors (see PIEPER, 141 *seq.*) The *Discorso* sent after Trivulzio (see MASSARELLI, 182; PALLAVICINI, II, 8, 4) is certainly not identical with the instructions, as Druffel believes (see MERKLE with regard to Massarelli, *loc. cit.*) Probably, however, the

who left Rome on July 5th,¹ emphasized the fact that the Pope would take no decisive steps before he received the answer of Henry II. Among the reasons which made the re-opening of the Council at Trent advisable, the first and most important was the fact that at the last Diet at Augsburg, all the States, Catholic as well as Protestant, had submitted to the decrees of the Council of Trent ; therefore, as the Germans were precisely the people who were most in need of such medicine, the Pope would be acting against his duty and the dictates of his conscience, were he not prepared to summon the Council again in the said city. The question as to the validity of the removal of the Council to Bologna under Paul III was, in the meantime, to remain undecided. Trivulzio was also instructed to call attention to the fact that, in the event of the refusal by the King to accept the Council, the Emperor would come to an understanding with the Protestants on his own responsibility and could then accuse the Pope of neglect of duty. The four considerations in the instructions of Pighino are almost the same as those of Trivulzio, who was also specially enjoined to keep on good terms with Cardinal Guise.²

When Pighino, whose journey occupied more than a month, reached the Emperor at Augsburg, on August 3rd, 1550,³

supposition of PIEPER (p. 14, n. 2) is correct, that the *ragione sottile* quoted by PALLAVICINI, II, 9, 2, belongs to this *Discorso*, and that the Emperor was anxious to promote the Council, but not to succeed in getting it, because, instead of being a political advantage, it might bring him into serious complications with Germany. Henry II. was also to be turned by this consideration from the idea that Charles V. would gain an advantage from the Council to the prejudice of France.

¹ MASSARELLI, 181.

² Julius III. had already addressed a special brief to Cardinal Guise, regarding the question of the Council on June 16, 1550 (see RAYNALDUS, 1550, n. 10 ; LE PLAT, IV., 165). *Briefs of June 16, 1550, to the "Card. de Borbonio, de Chatillon, de Vandomo, ducissae Valent," regarding the mission of Trivulzio, in Arm. 41, t. 56, n. 552 (Secret Archives of the Vatican).

³ See Marillac in DRUFFEL, I., 469.

the Diet, in spite of a poor attendance—none of the secular Electors appeared in person—had already opened. The French ambassador, Marillac, was of opinion that Charles V. had an object in not waiting for the arrival of Pighino, and that by opening the Diet quite unexpectedly on July 26th, although the date for so doing had been postponed till August 10th, 1550, he wished to anticipate by a proposition of his own,¹ any obstacles which might arise from the conditions of the nuncio. This proposition was to the following effect: the States of the last Diet had agreed that no better means could be found for the discussion and settlement of religious matters than a Christian General Council, and as the present Pope had graciously assented, and promised that the Council should, in accordance with the desire of the Emperor and the sanction of the States of the Diet, be continued and brought to an end at Trent, there was, in his opinion, nothing to be done in the matter, except to keep on urging the Pope to fulfil his promise.² The authorized agents of the two great Protestant princes, Maurice of Saxony and Joachim of Brandenburg, protested, however, against this. They expressly demanded that the Pope, as an interested party in the Council, should not preside, and that the Articles of Faith, which had already been defined, should again be discussed; a declaration to that effect was, however, not taken as being contrary to the decisions of the former Diet. The majority of the States, Catholic as well as Protestant, declared on August 20th, their agreement to the Emperor urging the Pope to continue the Council.³

Pighino had nothing but favourable reports to give of his reception by the Emperor, and of his deliberations with the chancellor, Granvelle,⁴ no essential differences having arisen between them. With regard to the Protestants, however,

¹ See *ibid.*, 459.

² See *ibid.*, 454 *seq.*, and JANNSEN-PASTOR, III., 707 *seq.*

³ Cf. DRUFFEL, I., 467, 477, 485, 494.

⁴ See Pighino's reports of August 10 in DE LEVA, V., 106 and August 12 in LAEMMER, Melet., 165 *seq.*, emendations in PIEPER, 10; *ibid.* a report of August 15. Cf. PALLAVICINI, II, 10, 1 *seq.*

Pighino could have no illusions.¹ It must have given him matter for serious consideration when, in the reply of the States to the Imperial counter-plea of October 8th, the demand of the Protestants that their representatives in the Council should also be heard concerning the points already decided, was once more repeated.²

The Emperor, however, sent the Pope a reassuring explanation of this incident, through his ambassador, Mendoza, telling him that they would listen to the Protestants, but alter nothing in the decisions already adopted, which they would simply repeat. Mendoza also gave assurances regarding Charles V.'s stay in Germany.³ In this manner perfect unity was established between the Pope and the Emperor, on this point at least, and nothing further now stood in the way of the Council being summoned.

The negotiations with France, however, were more difficult to carry through. The nuncio who was there at this time, Michele della Torre, spared no efforts to win over Henry II. to the plan of the Council. He was told, however, that no decision could be arrived at until after the arrival of Trivulzio. That the King was opposed to the plan is clear from his correspondence with his ambassador, Marillac, who was at that time at Augsburg.⁴

Trivulzio next received a polite letter from the King, in which he committed himself to nothing.⁵ Henry II. was endeavouring to defer a decision, but finally declared to the two representatives of the Pope, with brutal candour, that he had no interest in prolonging the Council, that his subjects did not require it, being good Catholics; should any fall away, they would be punished in such a manner that they might serve others as an example. He added that there was a sufficiency

¹ Cf. his reports of August 10 in DE LEVA, V., 105, of August 21 in LAEMMER, Melet., 165 *seq.*, and of September 5, 1550, in PIEPER, II *seq.* Cf. PASTOR, Reunionsbestrebungen, 422.

² DRUFFEL, I., 512 *seq.*

³ Cf. MAURENBRECHER, 230 *seq.*, 152*; MAYNIER, 594.

⁴ Cf. DRUFFEL, I., 431 *seqq.*, 451.

⁵ Cf. MASSARELLI, 187; PALLAVICINI, II, 10, 1.

of worthy prelates in France, who could carry out the reform of the clergy, without its being necessary to summon a General Council. With regard to the safety of Trent the King reminded the nuncios that the Pope, when he was Legate of the Council there, had feared for the safety of his own person, and had therefore undertaken the removal of the Council to Bologna. It seemed clear from this fact that Trent could not be so safe as His Holiness maintained; if, however, all the other princes declared themselves agreeable, then would he, the Most Christian King, do as his predecessors had done in similar circumstances.¹ This was all that the most earnest entreaties of the nuncios could draw from him. The French ambassador in Rome, d'Urfé, was instructed to speak to the Pope in the same fashion. Henry II. at once put forward the rights of the Gallican Church, ordered the observance of the decrees of the Council of Basle, and vigorously opposed the Pope's intended bestowal of the bishopric of Marseilles on his relative, Cristoforo del Monte.² To the brief addressed to the King by Julius III., on September 22nd, there came an answer as vague and disobliging as possible.³

The Pope did not allow himself to be disconcerted by the unfriendly attitude of France. However greatly he may have

¹ See Henry II. to d'Urfé on August 5, 1550, in RIBIER, II., 279. Cf. MAURENBRECHER, 231 *seq.*

² See the reports of d'Urfé and Cardinal Ipp. d'Este from Rome on August 29, 1550, in DRUFFEL, I., 495 *seqq.* Concerning the Marseilles affair (see MASSARELLI, 187), in which Julius III. eventually attained his object, see RUFFI, *Hist. de Marseille*, II., 35. Julius III. had already approached Henry II. regarding this matter in a *Brief of April 15 (Arm. 41, t. 55, n. 303. Secret Archives of the Vatican). Serristori speaks of the indignation of the Pope on account of the king's opposition in his *letter of August 23, 1550 (State Archives, Florence).

³ Cf. RAYNALDUS, 1550, n. 16; LE PLAT, IV., 167; Nuntiaturberichte, XII., xxxvi. Cf. the report of Cardinal Tournon in DRUFFEL, I., 511 *seq.*, to see how Julius III. sought to win over Henry II. in the question of the Council through the said Cardinal.

regretted the conduct of Henry II. he was still of opinion that after his recent negotiations with the Emperor, he might take steps to summon the Council. On October 3rd, 1550, Julius III., who just at the moment was highly delighted by the news of the conquest of Mehadia,¹ on the north coast of Africa, announced to the consistory his intention of publishing a Bull to carry out this decision.² Animated by a most lively desire to arrange this important matter,³ he worked personally at the drafting of this official document.⁴ It was to be in the

¹ Acta. consist. in RAYNALDUS, 1550, n. 26. Letter of the postmaster Taxis in LACOMBLET, Archiv., VI., 166 seq. On October 5 a Mass of thanksgiving was celebrated in St. Peter's *pro expugnata Africa a christianis* (MASSARELLI, 194). Cf. the *letters of Gir. Biagio of September 20 and 22, and October 4, 1550 (State Archives, Bologna) and the *report of Serristori of October 30, 1550 (State Archives, Florence). A *brief of congratulation of October 8, 1550, to Jo. de Vega, viceroy of Sicily, in Arm. 41, t. 58, n. 880 (Secret Archives of the Vatican). The viceroy afterwards sent Turkish trophies to Rome (see RAYNALDUS, 1550, n. 27). Concerning this matter see ZINKEISEN, II., 875, and GUGLIELMOTTI, II., 237 seq.; see also *ibid.* concerning the help given by the Pope in the expedition.

² See Acta consist. in LAEMMER, Melet. 206, and the *report of Serristori mentioned in previous note.

³ In opposition to the groundless suspicions of Druffel, who follows the lead of the apostate Vergerio, whose heart was filled with hatred (concerning his polemic cf. HUBERT, 50 seqq., and the Archiv für Reformationsgesch., VIII., 325 seqq.) is a *report of September 27, 1550, of Serristori, who is by no means over favourable to Julius III.; in this he says: *Vedesi che S.Stà va d'ottime gambe in dette cose del concilio et ch'ella piglia gran dispiacer di veder chel Christianissimo non condescende sin qui a mandar i suoi prelati a Trento, et per il modo [con] che vengono i Francesi in questa et in ogni altra cosa che hanno di trattar con S.Stà si mostra da più cose che la dice in qualche ristretto molto sdegnata contra di loro, et quanto biasima l'attitudine di questi, tanto loda et inalza quella di S.Mtà (the italics in cypher). State Archives, Florence.

⁴ Dandino to the nuncio at Venice on October 18, 1550, in PALLAVICINI, II, II, 3.

hands of the nuncio by the middle of October. This, however, proved to be impossible, as it was desired to await the arrival of Cardinals Cervini, Pole and Morone, who were to be the first to examine the draft.¹ On November 10th, it reached the hands of the other Cardinals who were deputed to act in the matter of the Council, viz. : de Cupis, Carafa, Tournon, Juan Alvarez, de Toledo, and Crescenzi.² In order to avert all difficulties, they at once agreed to avoid the expression "continuance of the Council" in the official document.³

The text of the Bull was considered once more on November 12th, by a meeting of the eight Cardinals, in the presence of Julius III., and the Pope's draft was unanimously approved. On the following day the Pope and Cervini again went through the important document for the last time, and on November 14th it was read and sanctioned in a secret consistory.⁴ The decision gave universal satisfaction, and it was also reported that the Pope would repair to Bologna in the spring in order to be nearer to the seat of the Council.⁵

¹ *Report of Serristori of September 27, and **letter of Buonanni of October 13, 1550. (State Archives, Florence).

² MASSARELLI, 199. Cf. Buonanni's *report of October 25, 1550 (State Archives, Florence). Later (February 24, 1551) MASSARELLI (p. 216) names Verallo instead of Morone as a member of the commission.

³ See the **report of Buonanni of October 13, 1550 (State Archives, Florence).

⁴ See MASSARELLI, 200 and two *reports of Buonanni of November 14 in the State Archives, Florence. In the *letter of Dandino to Ricci, then in Portugal, dated Rome, November 13, 1550, he says : *La qual bolla è stata fatta tutta da Sua Beat^{ne} propria senza che sia stata bisogno mutarne pure una parola non ostante che sia stata vista diligentemente considerata dalli principali del collegio et ultimamente da tutti. (Ricci Archives, Rome).

⁵ *Letter of G. Biagio of November 15, 1550 (State Archives, Bologna). Julius III. had already spoken of a journey to Bologna in the interests of the Council (see the *report of Buonanni of September 25, 1550. State Archives, Florence). The plan of such a journey also played a great part during the summer and

In the Bull, which did in fact avoid the expression "continuance," Julius III. announced his intention of labouring for the peace of the Church, the spread of the Christian Faith and true religion, and of providing, as far as lay in his power, for the tranquillity of Germany. As it was his right, in virtue of his office, to summon and direct General Councils, the Pope addresses to the patriarchs, archbishops, bishops, abbots and all upon whom it may be incumbent to assist at a General Council of the Church, the earnest admonition and invitation to repair to the city of Trent on the coming 1st of May, the day fixed for the re-opening of the Council begun under Paul III.; the Papal Legates, through whom he intended to preside at the Council, should he be prevented from doing so in person,¹ would also be there.

The Bull was sent at once in the original to Pighino, on November 15th, so that he might hand it to the Emperor. In the letter which accompanied it, the nuncio received instructions to beg Charles V. to have the document published as quickly as possible, as it was only to be made known in Rome after its publication in Germany. It was also explained at the same time why May 1st had been chosen for the opening

autumn of 1551 (see *Nuntiaturberichte*, XII., 52, 67 *seq.*, 71 *seq.*, 74, 78; DRUFFEL, III., 241, 251 *seq.*) According to the entry of September 14, 1550, in the *Tesor. seg.* (State Archives, Rome) the journey was then decided; on September 25, 1551, on the other hand, Ipp. Capilupi writes: *La partita di S.Stà per Bologna è quasi in tutto esclusa, il vice Re di Napoli, il s^r duca di Firenze et tutta la corte di Roma disuadono a S.Stà il partirsi, resta solo che s'intenda quel che S.M^{tà} consiglia, et domani che sarà qui il s^r Don Diego col s^r Gio. Marrique si intenderà l'opinione di S.M^{tà} con la risoluzione di S.Stà (Gonzaga Archives, Mantua). Julius III. still cherished the idea of undertaking the journey, in January, 1552 (see DRUFFEL, II., 8, 18 *seq.*) but did not succeed in doing so.

¹ RAYNALDUS, 1550, n. 21. Bull. VI., 430 *seq.* Concerning a proclamation of the Council composed by the Protestants, which is in reality a satire, see MENZEL, III., 364 n.; cf. HUBERT, 78 *seq.*

date instead of Laetare Sunday as originally fixed. The reason given for this was that the prelates should not be absent from their churches during Lent and at the festival of Easter, and also the high cost of provisions prevailing at that season, which would disappear at the approaching harvest. On the same date, November 15th, copies of the Bull were sent to Venice, Spain and Portugal.¹

The messenger who carried the document arrived at Augsburg on November 21st, and on the following day Pighino handed the Bull to the Emperor. The latter praised it as a most admirable document, but was not quite in agreement with the drafting, as he feared that the manner in which the points already deliberated upon and decided in former sessions of the Council, were alluded to, would give rise to an inimical attitude on the part of the Protestants. It was not until December 15th that Pighino could report to Rome that the Bull had been made public.² Thereupon Julius III. ordered, on December 27th, that it should be read during mass at St. Peter's and at the Lateran, and generally made known to the public by being affixed to the church doors. This took place on January 1st, 1551, the Bull being then printed and sent in the course of January to all the bishops of the world. The Pope had invited the Polish episcopate to the Council as early as December 20th, 1550, in a brief of that date informing them of the immediate dispatch of the Bull.³

Charles V. as was characteristic of him, had a secret protest drawn up on January 3rd, 1551, in which he took precautions against any possible disadvantages which might arise from his consent to a Bull which did not altogether satisfy him; he required in particular that the position he had taken up with regard to the transference of the Council to Bologna should not be affected.⁴

¹ See MASSARELLI, 200 *seq.*; Nuntiaturberichte, XII., xxxvii.

² Cf. RAYNALDUS, 1550, n. 19; Nuntiaturberichte, XII., xxxvii.; MAURENBRECHER, 231, n. 14; DRUFFEL, I., 550 n.; DE LEVA, V., III *seq.*

³ RAYNALDUS, 1550, n. 42; MASSARELLI, 209, 211; LE PLAT, IV., 169.

⁴ MAURENBRECHER, 152*, *seqq.*

In the "Farewell to the Diet" published on February 13th, 1551, the Emperor gave expression to his views on the Council in the following terms: he had considered the Council the best manner of regulating religious questions satisfactorily, and through his negotiations with the Pope, he had succeeded in having the Synod summoned to Trent on the following 1st of May; the Bull in connection with this had been communicated to the States of the Diet. As these had declared that they accepted the Council and submitted themselves to it, the Emperor expected that this would now be held, and, now that the announcement had been made, that the Princes would support the Council in every way. He, on his side, would do everything incumbent on him, as patron of Holy Church and protector of the Council. He expressly assured, by his Imperial might and power, to all who wished to attend the Council, a free and unhindered journey, freedom of speech, and a free and safe return home. He also declared that he would remain within the confines of the Empire, and, as far as possible, in the neighbourhood, in order that his assistance might be granted to the Council, so that it might be brought to a good and just conclusion, conducive to the well-being of the whole of Christendom, but particularly to a settled peace and to the tranquillity and union of the German nation. He therefore requested the Electors, the Princes, and the States of the Empire, and above all, the ecclesiastical Princes and the adherents of the Protestant, to hold themselves in readiness for the Council, in accordance with the Papal proclamation.¹

On March 4th, 1551, Julius III., in consistory, appointed the eminent Cardinal Marcello Crescenzi, a man of strictly ecclesiastical views, as *Legatus de latere* and first president of the Council, Archbishop Sebastiano Pighino of Siponto, and Luigi Lippomano, Bishop of Verona, as apostolic nuncios, who were to take their places as presidents at the side of the Legate.² The brief of the same date authorizes the said

¹ LE PLAT, IV., 170 *seq.*; *cf.* PASTOR, Reunionsbestrebungen, 422 *seq.*

² See THEINER, I., 473 *seq.*; MASSARELLI, 217; PALLAVICINI, II, 13, 1; MAYNIER, 599 *seq.* Crescenzi's appointment had

bishops, in the name of the Pope, to preside at the Council, as he cannot proceed in person to Trent on account of his age, his shaken state of health and other obstacles.¹ On March 8th, the Pope, who was confined to bed with an attack of gout, bestowed on the Cardinal legate, Crescenzi, the legate's cross, in his bed-chamber, in the presence of all the Cardinals. Two days later Crescenzi left Rome and proceeded to Bologna, there to await further developments.² A political question which had most urgently engaged the attention of Julius III. ever since his elevation to the Papal throne, threatened at this time to prove fateful to the Council now in course of preparation.

In accordance with the election capitulation, the Pope had, very soon after his accession, given Parma, as a fief of the church, to Ottavio Farnese, and he endeavoured to obtain the assent of Charles V. and Henry II. to this step.³ In the long wearisome discussions concerning this matter, the question as to the possession of Piacenza came up for consideration. The Emperor's answer to Pighino on this point was not very gratifying; the lawful claims of the church and the state, he said, must first be debated in detail, and the question of possession afterwards decided. This meant, in other words, that the right of the stronger was to prevail.⁴ It soon came to light that Charles was also stretching out his hand for Parma. He proposed to the Pope that the latter should invest him with Parma and Piacenza, and that he should indemnify Ottavio Farnese from another quarter.⁵ Although Julius III. declared such a solution to be impossible, the Farnese family despaired more and more of any successful result of the Pope's mediation. To the realization that an amicable return of Piacenza could not be reckoned on, was

already been expected on February 25; see *report of Serristori of February 26, 1551 (State Archives, Florence).

¹ RAYNALDUS, 1551, n. 4. LE PLAT, IV., 210 *seq.*

² THEINER, I., 474. MASSARELLI, 218.

³ Cf. *supra* p. 55.

⁴ See PALLAVICINI, II, 10, 4; DE LEVA, V., 120 *seq.*

⁵ Cf. DRUFFEL, I., 416.

added the fear of their mortal enemy, Ferrante Gonzaga, the Viceroy of Milan. In order to maintain their rights in Parma, the Farnese began negotiations with France, always willing to interfere in Italian affairs and to resist the preponderance of the Emperor there.¹

The danger to the peace of Italy and the renewal of the Council which would result from these proceedings was obvious to everyone. The Bishop of Fano, Pietro Bertano, was sent to the Emperor as plenipotentiary at the end of January, 1551, to discuss the measures to be taken. It unfortunately happened, however, that Bertano fell ill on the journey, and only reached Charles V. at the beginning of April²; by this time, however, the Farnese were already deeply engaged with Henry II.

The Pope made the greatest efforts to prevent this dangerous turn of affairs. On February 16th, 1551, he had sent his chamberlain, Pietro Camaiani, to Ottavio Farnese, with instructions to dissuade his vassal from his dangerous purpose, either by threats or promises.³ On February 27th a very earnest brief was addressed to Ottavio, reminding him that as Standard-Bearer, Captain-General of the Church, and vassal of the Holy See, he could not serve any foreign prince without the consent of the Pope, or receive any foreign garrison in Parma; the Pope forbade any such proceedings under threats of the penalties incurred by rebels; should he have already undertaken any engagements contrary to his fealty, he must

¹ Cf. DE LEVA, V., 122 *seqq.*

² See DRUFFEL, I., 563 *seq.*; PIEPER, 17, 143; here (p. 17, n. 4) are particulars concerning the letter to Pighino of March 12, 1551, on which DE LEVA (V., 126) lays too much stress. *Briefs concerning the mission of Bertano, dated January 26, 1551, addressed to Charles V., Philip II., Ferdinand I. and others in Arm. 41, t. 59, n. 36-38. Secret Archives of the Vatican.

³ See DRUFFEL, I., 576; PIEPER, 18. Ipp. Capilupi announced on February 14, 1551: *S.Stà mostra di haver molto a male queste pratiche che tengono Farnesi con Francia (Gonzaga Archives, Mantua).

at once free himself from them.¹ A *monitorium* of March 5th repeated this menacing admonition.² It proved, however, as vain as the representations which the Pope made to the French king, through his nuncio.³ On March 12th Philippe de Sipierre left Lyons for Parma with a treaty of alliance, which Ottavio signed. His enemies, as he wrote to his brother Alessandro on March 24th, sought to poison him and wrest Parma from him; he had resolved, however, to defend the city to his last breath.⁴

The Pope was all the more indignant at this revolt on the part of his vassal, as he had hitherto, overwhelmed the Farnese family with favours. What was, however, to be done? If he interfered, the French king, who was already threatening a National Council, would definitely refuse him obedience; should he on the other hand tolerate the behaviour of Ottavio, then he would not only break with the Emperor, but would also lose the respect of the other princes, of the Cardinals, and of his vassals. In addition to all this the lamentable state of the papal finances had to be considered.⁵ Punishment of the rebel was out of the question without the help of the Emperor. In order to assure himself of this assistance, Julius III. resolved to send the cleverest diplomatist of the

¹ *Brevia Iulii III. in Arm. 41, t. 59, n. 95; *ibid.*, n. 96 to Paulus de Vitellis, dated February 27, 1550: if Ottavio Farnese did not obey, he was to leave him at once (Secret Archives of the Vatican). The *original brief appointing him Standard Bearer of the Church, dated March 8, 1550, is in the State Archives, Carte Farnes.

² See PALLAVICINI, II, 13, 2.

³ Cf. Nuntiaturberichte, XII., xli. P. Camaiani returned to Rome on March 7, and reported to the Pope, who was confined to his room with an attack of gout. *Letter of Buonanni of March 8, 1551 (State Archives, Florence).

⁴ See CUGNONI, Prose ined. di A. Caro, 118 *seq.*; DE LEVA, V., 130 *seq.* Concerning the French threats of a National Council see DESJARDINS, III., 250.

⁵ Cf. Legaz. di Serristori, 259-260; DE LEVA, in the Riv. stor., I., 645.

Curia, his secretary of state, Dandino, to the Imperial court at Augsburg.

In the instructions for Dandino, personally drawn up by the Pope on March 31st, the situation with the Farnese family was once more explained, and the desire to form an alliance with the Emperor most strongly emphasized. It was his wish, Julius III. continued, to sail in the same ship with the Emperor, and to share the same fate as his, for he knew how closely his interests, especially those concerning religion, were bound up with those of Charles; should an appeal to arms, in spite of all efforts, become inevitable, it being intolerable that a miserable creature like Ottavio Farnese should defy at once the Emperor and the Pope, then Charles, as the more powerful and the more experienced in the art of war, must decide what was to be done.¹

This resolve of the Pope to make a stand against Ottavio Farnese, in close alliance with the Emperor, was still further strengthened when, on the day of the departure of Dandino (April 1st, 1551), the ambassador of Charles, on his return to Rome from Siena, assured Julius of the support of his master. However urgently the Imperialists insisted on the immediate opening of the Council, it will easily be understood that Julius III. shrank from so doing.² On April 2nd, the newly appointed representative of France, Termes, openly declared the intention of his king to summon a National Council, and announce the withdrawal of his allegiance to the Pope, should the latter take steps against Ottavio Farnese.³ This was the very way to drive such a passionate man as Julius III. to extremes.

¹ The *Registro originale of the Instructions of Julius III., signed by G. Canano, in the Secret Archives of the Vatican, begins with those for Dandino (Polit. 78, p. 55 *seq.*) For this see PIEPER, 143 *seq.*, with the emendations to the text of DRUFFEL, I., 602 *seq.* A *letter of introduction for Dandino to Cardinal Madruzzo, dated Rome, March 31, 1551, in the vice-regal Archives, Innsbruck.

² See Legaz. di Serristori, 261 *seq.*

³ See Lasso's report in DRUFFEL, I., 609.

In a consistory of April 6th, the Pope declared that if his admonitions and threats remained without effect, he would force his rebellious vassal to submission by the power of arms. He then bitterly complained of the attempt of the French king to stand in the way of the meeting of a General Council of the Church, by summoning a National Council. His plan, however, would not succeed ; he was determined to open the Council at Trent, even in face of the danger that he might be forced to proceed to the excommunication and deposition of a ruler who sought to prevent an assembly so necessary for the well-being of Christendom.¹

The French had not expected such an uncompromising speech. It appeared that the threats of their king had only hastened the decision to declare the Council open, at least formally. Termes, as well as Cardinals d'Este and Tournon, therefore did everything in their power to minimize the significance of the summoning of a French National Council. This very attempt to excuse a proceeding which was in itself inexcusable irritated Julius III. still more ; he expressed himself in the strongest language against Ottavio Farnese, as against Henry II.² On April 11th, 1551, a *monitorium poenale* was issued against Ottavio, who had made himself guilty of rebellion by the reception of foreign troops.³

¹ Concerning the consistory of April 6, *cf.* the letter of Este in RIBIER, II., 317 *seq.* and that of Lasso in DRUFFEL, I., 609 *seq.*, as well as the detailed *report of Serristori of April 6, 1551 (State Archives, Florence). See also the *letter of Julius III. to Dandino of April 10, 1551, in the Secret Archives of the Vatican, Borghese II., 465, p. 9 *seqq.* Copies in the Royal Library, Berlin, Inf. polit. XIX., 336-343, and in the Barberini Library, LVIII., 12.

² Besides the reports of Cardinals d'Este and Tournon of April 8, 1551, in RIBIER, II., 319 *seq.*, and the detailed *letters of Serristori of April 8 and 10 (State Archives, Florence) see the statement of the Pope himself in his *letter to Dandino of April 10 (Barberini Library, LVIII., 12), from which DE LEVA quotes a sentence (V., 136).

³ *Monitorium poenale contra ill. dom. Oct. Farnesium. Romae* apud A. Bladum, 1551. *Cf.* CHIESI, 221.

After these outbursts of anger, there followed days, as is frequently the case with those of a sanguine temperament, when the state of affairs appeared in quite a different light.¹ The break with Ottavio Farnese naturally entailed that with Henry II., who could put the greatest difficulties in the way of the Council and perhaps even bring about a schism. Besides this, was the needful help on the part of the Emperor certain? Another consideration as far as Italy was concerned also weighed even more heavily in the scale. How was it possible to carry on a war, when the money chests were empty, and an unproductive year threatened the States of the Church with famine? Powerful voices were also raised in earnest warning against precipitation in beginning the hostilities, which the Emperor was urging. A letter from Cardinal Crescenzi, who stood high in the Pope's estimation, was specially urgent in advising caution.² To all this was added the hostile attitude towards this war of the people of Rome, where it was said, to the great vexation of Julius III., that the Pope was nothing but a weak tool in the hands of the Spaniards.³ It is not, therefore, to be wondered at that the Pope wavered to the last moment and made new attempts to settle this unhappy strife about Parma.⁴ All endeavours, however, proved vain, and on May 22nd Ottavio Farnese was declared, in a secret consistory, to have forfeited his fief;

¹ How quickly Julius III. changed his moods is shown by the second *letter which he sent to Dandino on April 10, 1551 (Secret Archives of the Vatican. Borghese II., 465, p. 13 *seq.*) A passage from it in ROMIER, 242.

² See the passage from the letter of Julius III. of April 10, 1551, in DE LEVA, V., 191, n. 2.

³ Cf. Legaz. di Serristori, 274 *seq.* Concerning the feeling in Rome see the report of Niccolò da Ponte in DE LEVA, V., 152.

⁴ Cf. the detailed description of the vacillation of Julius III. in DE LEVA, V., 136 *seqq.* Concerning the mission of Cardinal Medici to Ott. Farnese and of Ascanio della Corgna to France see CUGNONI, Prose ined. di A. Caro, 89 *seq.*; PIEPER, 20 *seq.*, 144 *seq.*; ROMIER, 242 *seqq.* Romier has explained the mission of Jean de Monluc (p. 246 *seqq.*)

five days later Henry II. pledged himself to supply Farnese with money and equipment.¹ The question was to be decided by the force of arms.

¹ See Legaz. di Serristori, 274 ; FONTANINI, 388 *seq.* ; PAL-LAVICINI, 11, 16, 2 ; ROMIER, 245.

CHAPTER IV.

SECOND PERIOD OF THE COUNCIL OF TRENT.

REGARDLESS of the political situation, which was from day to day growing darker, Julius III. continued his preparations for the General Council, which he determined to open at the appointed time in spite of every difficulty.¹ On April 15th, 1551, he again entrusted Angelo Massarelli with the post of secretary to the Council. Massarelli started on the following day for Bologna, which he reached on the 19th. On the part of the Pope he announced to the Legate, Crescenzi, who was staying there, that the Council was in any case to be opened on May 1st, but only by the Legate himself if news should have by that time have come from Dandino that such was the wish of the Emperor ; otherwise the opening ceremony was to be undertaken by the second and third presidents, Pighino and Lippomano. On April 23rd Massarelli was in Trent, where the final preparations were being made for the opening of the Council. The Palazzo Ghiroldi, where the Legate was also to reside, was being fitted up for holding the congregations, while the sessions were to take place in the venerable Cathedral of St. Vigilius.²

Dandino arrived in Trent from his legation on April 24th, and announced that the Emperor agreed to the opening ; he

¹ *Su S^{ad} esta bueno, a Dio gracias, y muy determinado que el concilio se encomience para el dia determinado. Cardinal Pacheco to Cardinal Madruzzo, dated Rome, April 9, 1551 (Vice-regal Archives, Innsbruck).

² See MASSARELLI, 223-224. By a *Brief of April 22, 1551, Massarelli received authority to enjoy the revenues of the priory S. Severini dioec. Camarac. (Arm. 41, t. 60, n. 291. Secret Archives of the Vatican).

only desired that they should proceed slowly, until more prelates, and especially the Germans, should have arrived.¹

The presidents of the Council, Crescenzi, Pighino and Lippomano, made their solemn entry into Trent on April 29th, 1551. Cardinal Madruzzo, four archbishops and nine bishops welcomed them there. On the following day Francisco de Toledo arrived as ambassador of the Emperor, and the first General Congregation was held on April 30th. Cardinal Crescenzi declared that in accordance with the will of the Pope, the Council must be opened on the following day. This was unanimously agreed to, but a second proposal of Crescenzi, that the next session should take place after four months, on September 1st, met at first with lively opposition. In answer to this Pighino maintained that a Council could not be held with Spaniards and Italians alone, the presence of German prelates was also necessary ; they should not, moreover, give the Protestants a valid reason for refusing to acknowledge the Council. In view of these reasons, the second proposal was then accepted.²

On the following day, May 1st, 1551, the eleventh Session of the Council of Trent, the first under Julius III., took place, with a very poor attendance. After solemn high mass by Cardinal Crescenzi, the conventual Franciscan, Sigismondo Fedrio of Diruta preached a sermon. After that the secretary of the Council, Massarelli, read aloud the Bull summoning the Council, and the brief nominating the presidents, and Alepo, the Archbishop of Sassari, the decree for the re-opening of the Council, as well as making the announcement that the next session would not take place till September 1st, so that the Germans might have time to appear in Trent. On the same May 1st, the Pope, in Rome, had gone in solemn procession from S. Marco to the church of SS. Apostoli, where a mass of the Holy Ghost was celebrated for the happy issue of

¹ RAYNALDUS, 1551, n. 5. MASSARELLI, 224.

² MASSARELLI, 225 *seq.* THEINER, Acta, I., 475 *seqq.* Letter of Crescenzi to Dandino of May 1, 1551, in DRUFFEL, I., 632 *seq.* ; *cf.* also PIEPER, 33, n. 1.

the Council, while at the same time, the Jubilee indulgence, already proclaimed, was extended throughout the whole world.¹

In the course of the month of May, several other Spanish bishops arrived in Trent. On April 24th, in consistory, the Pope had already called upon the eighty-four prelates then resident in Rome to repair at once to Trent. As this had had no effect, the dilatory prelates were once more requested to be there by September 1st. A number of letters of summons were also issued during the same month of May.²

Although the Emperor also showed great zeal for the furtherance of the Council,³ the prospects for the assembly still looked very gloomy, for Henry II., determined to employ every means to turn the Pope from his proceedings against Ottavio Farnese, worked his very hardest against the Council. He broke off diplomatic relations with the Pope at the beginning of July, and his ambassador, Paul de Labarthe, Sieur de Termes, made a formal protest against the Council, in the

¹ See MASSARELLI, 227-229; THEINER, *Acta*, I., 480. At this session, in which Crescenzi avoided the use of the word "continuation," there were present, besides the three Presidents, Cardinal Madruzzo, four archbishops, ten bishops, eleven theologians and the Imperial ambassador. The Indulgence Bull of April 26, 1551, in LE PLAT, IV., 217 *seqq.* The Pope approved of what had been done in the opening session, and arranged the place to be offered to Cardinal Madruzzo in a manner agreeable to the latter; see MASSARELLI, 230 *seq.*

² Cf. MASSARELLI, 229 *seqq.*; RAYNALDUS, 1551, n. 9 and 10; LE PLAT, IV., 220 *seq.*; WIRZ, *Bullen*, 360.

³ See Nuntiaturberichte, XII., 2 *seq.*; POSTINA in the *Römischen Quartalschrift*, XVIII., 385 *seqq.* An edition of the documents of the second period of the Council of Trent, by Postina, adequate to modern requirements, is awaited. This edition, and especially the correspondence in connection therewith, to be edited by the Görres Society, must be waited for, as only then will a definite presentation of the second period of the Council of Trent be possible. The reports at present available, though very abundant, are only from the Imperial side, and are so biassed that they can only be used with the greatest caution.

consistory, before his departure. "Now," it was said in this official document, otherwise couched in respectful language, "that the war has begun in Italy, the necessary tranquillity for such an assembly cannot be found, and the prelates of his kingdom will not be present in Trent."¹

Henry II. also worked against the fortunes of the Council among the Catholics in Switzerland. The "Most Christian King" was not ashamed to ally himself for this purpose with one of the most active enemies of the Church, Pietro Paolo Vergerio.²

On July 21st, 1551, irritated to the highest degree at the devastation of the district round Bologna by the troops under Termes, the former French ambassador in Rome, Julius III. addressed a threatening letter to Henry II., in which he summoned him to appear before the judgment seat of God. The King then gave instructions to the nuncio, Trivulzio, to leave the court. He was ready, he declared, to appear before God's judgment seat, although he knew he would not meet the Pope there. He regarded the latter as among the worst and most ungrateful of men, whose unjust excommunication he did not fear. In the royal council the question was discussed as to whether the French church should fully withdraw her allegiance from the Pope, and nominate a special patriarch for France. It was Charles de Guise, the Cardinal of Lorraine, who, above all others, dissuaded the King from such a fateful step. Henry II. declared he would fight Julius III., not with spiritual but with secular weapons. Ten thousand men were in readiness to start for Italy. In order to touch the Pope in a tender spot, all Frenchmen were forbidden to send money to Rome to acquire benefices or dispensations.³ This measure, which was adopted on September 3rd, was equivalent to a breach of the Concordat.⁴

¹ Cf. RIBIER, II., 329 *seqq.*; LE PLAT, IV., 227 *seq.*; PAL-LAVICINI, II, 16; ROMIER, 27-28.

² See RAYNALDUS, 1551, n. 10 *seq.*; HUBERT, 99 *seqq.* Cf. also J. G. MAYER, *Das Konzil von Trient und die Gegenreformation in der Schweiz*, I., Stans, 1901.

³ See ROMIER, 30 *seq.*, 33 *seq.*, 41.

⁴ THOMAS, III., 13.

The small number of prelates and ambassadors present in Trent increased slowly until September. Besides the Spaniards and several Italians, the first Germans also arrived, and on June 17th, the suffragan bishop of Würzburg, Georg Flach, reached Trent. Count Hugo de Montfort arrived as the Emperor's second ambassador on July 29th.¹ The attendance of the ecclesiastical Electors at the Council was of special importance. At first these had wished to excuse themselves, but the Legate, Crescenzi, represented to them in an emphatic manner how greatly their position made it incumbent on them to attend in person; the Protestants must also be prevented from making their absence an excuse for doing likewise. Lippomano was actively engaged in the same direction.² The three Prince-Electors thereupon resolved to undertake the journey to Trent. On August 17th four of the doctors, sent in advance by the Elector of Trêves, arrived on the scene,

¹ See MASSARELLI, 237, 240. See *ibid.*, 235 and 237 concerning the visit of Philip of Spain and Maximilian of Bohemia, who were both travelling to Spain. Maximilian was again in Trent on the return journey, from December 13 to 16 (see Nuntiaturberichte, XII., 359 *seq.*) Julius III. first deputed A. de Grassi, and then his nephew, Ascanio della Corgna, to welcome King Maximilian and the Queen of Bohemia to Italy: "quo nos coniunctiorem aut cariorem habemus neminem" (see brief to the Queen of Bohemia of November 25, 1550. Arm. 41, t. 58, n. 872; n. 873 in like manner to the King). Concerning the welcome see Nuntiaturberichte, XII., 145. Julius III. had addressed a *brief to Philip of Spain on June 10, 1551, to the following effect: he had sent his nephew, G. B. del Monte, "quo nemo nobis carior, nemo nobis coniunctior est," to meet him, when Philip came from Germany, and to welcome him and invite him to Rome; as Philip's arrival was delayed, he now sent him Hieronymus episc. Imol. (Dandino), so that the prince might not travel unwelcomed through Italy (Arm. 41, t. 60, n. 446). On the return journey of Maximilian A. de Grassi was sent to welcome him; see *Brief for Maximilian and his consort of November 23, 1551 (Arm. 41, t. 62, n. 858. Secret Archives of the Vat.)

² See LE PLAT, IV., 221 *seq.*, 224 *seq.*

among them the learned Dominican, Ambrosius Pelargus.¹ On August 29th the two Electors, Sebastian von Heusenstamm, Archbishop of Mayence, and Johann von Isenburg, Archbishop of Trêves, made their entry into the city. The arrival of these important representatives of the German church, to whom were also added in October the Elector of Cologne, Adolf von Schauenburg, was the more joyfully welcomed as it was hoped that numerous bishops of the Empire would now attend. On August 29th the suffragan bishop of Mayence, Balthasar Fanneman, also arrived, and on the following day the learned Bishop of Vienna, Frederic Nausea, as ambassador of Ferdinand, King of the Romans.² The bishops, however, who were in Rome, had not yet put in an appearance. The bitter words to which the Legate, Crescenzi, had given utterance with regard to the absence of these prelates, were fully justified. At the same time the outbreak of war in the north of Italy, and the poverty of many Italian bishops, are reasons that must be taken into consideration.³ The Pope was not in a position to help in this, as the salaries of the presidents and other

¹ MASSARELLI, 241. Concerning Pelargus see JANNSEN-PASTOR, VII., 556 *seq.*, and the special literature quoted there.

² See MASSARELLI, 241 *seq.*; Nuntiaturberichte, XII., 52; POSTINA, Billick, 117. In the *brief of November 13, 1550, the Pope thanked Nausea for sending his Compendium concilii Constant. (Arm. 41, t. 58, n. 950). This is the brief which J. G. MAYER quotes in the *Histor. Jahrb.*, VIII., 23, with the wrong date December 12. Copies of the documents quoted by Mayer, from the Town Library, Schaffhausen, relative to the doings of Nausea at the Council, are also to be found in the Seminary Library, Mayence. The manuscripts in the Court Library, Vienna, and especially the papers of Nausea in Schaffhausen on the subject, will be issued by Postina in his great publication. Cardinal Truchsess of Augsburg also wished to go to Trent, and applied to the Pope in this connection, but Julius informed him that he had better wait, as the Cardinals were not summoned by the Bull. Against the explanation of this letter by DRUFFEL, (I., 801) see PIEPER, 34, n. 1.

³ This is rightly brought out by PIEPER (p. 34); *cf.* Nuntiaturberichte, XII., lxii.

officials of the Council required considerable sums, while the upkeep of the troops sent against Ottavio Farnese quite exhausted his already limited resources. Julius III. did, however, what he could. A Bull of August 27th, 1551, repeated under threats of penalties for the dilatory, the order that all prelates should personally attend the Council. Similar admonitions were given by the Cardinals deputed to deal with the Council. The Pope, moreover, held fast to his resolution that the next session of the Council should, under any circumstances, be held on September 1st.¹

On the proposal of the Legate the General Congregation at Trent accordingly resolved, on August 31st, that the appointed session should take place on the following day, the next being fixed for October 11th.² The Pope even thought at that time of proceeding with his whole court to Bologna, in the interests of the Council, a plan which had already been considered, but which, on this occasion also, had to be abandoned on financial grounds.³

On September 1st the three presidents, Cardinal Madruzzo, the two Prince-Electors, five other archbishops, twenty-six bishops and twenty-five theologians assembled for the twelfth Session, the second under Julius III.⁴ High Mass was celebrated by the Archbishop of Cagliari, and instead of a sermon,

¹ See LE PLAT, IV., 231 seq.; Nuntiaturberichte, XII., 57 seq. By the *brief of September 1, 1551, to *Iac. Iacomello episc. Bellicastr.* the charge was given to the latter of seeing to "necessaria ad cellebr. concilii et presertim hospitia et victualia conventuris." (Arm. 41, t. 61, n. 749. Secret Archives of the Vatican).

² MASSARELLI, 242. THEINER, Acta, I., 483 seq.

³ How seriously this journey was planned may be seen from the *Briefs in Arm. 41, t. 61, n. 790: *Iac. Fabri cubicul.* dated September 11, 1551 (commissariat for provisions in Bologna); n. 841: *Commissariis super hospitiiis* for the journey to Bologna, dated September 20, 1551; *ibid.* n. 842 and 843: *ad aptandas vias*; n. 844: *ad victualia paranda*; n. 845: *ad hospit. pro sacramentum portant.* (Secret Archives of the Vatican).

⁴ MASSARELLI, 242. THEINER, Acta, I., 486 seq. RAYNALDUS, 1551, n. 27 seq. Corpo dipl. Port., VI., 55.

the secretary of the Council, Massarelli, read a long admonition by the presidents to those assembled. The credentials of the ambassadors of Charles V. and Ferdinand I. were also received, and it was decided that the Sacrament of the Holy Eucharist and the duty of residence of bishops should be dealt with at the next session on October 11th.

At the conclusion of the session a French envoy, Jacques Amyot, sent by Cardinal Tournon, who was then staying in Venice, arrived. He presented a letter from Henry II. as well as another document, and demanded that they should be read. As the letter of the French king was addressed "to the Fathers of the Convention of Trent," thereby purposely avoiding the term "Council," the Spaniards vigorously opposed the reading of the document. The Legate, with the fathers of the Council, retired to the sacristy to decide upon the matter. It was resolved to comply with Amyot's request, in order not to embitter the French king still more, with the express declaration, however, that the Council accepted the title in a favourable sense; at the same time should this not have been the king's intention in so addressing it, then the letter could not be regarded as having been addressed to a Council of the Church.

Thereupon Massarelli read the king's letter, and Amyot the other document. The purpose of the latter, while referring to the declaration previously made in the consistory by the French ambassador, was again to offer reasons for the uncompromising attitude of Henry II. towards the Council, and to protest against it. While covering the Pope with reproaches, he laid stress on the fact that he had not been able to send his bishops as, in the present political state of affairs, the journey was not safe; he regarded the Council from which he had been unwillingly excluded, not as a general, but rather as a private assembly, as it seemed to him rather to further the private advantage of those for whose pleasure it had been summoned, than to serve the general interests of the Church. On this account neither the French king nor the French nation, any more than the prelates and ministers of the Gallican Church should be bound by the decrees of the Council. He then declared openly and solemnly that he would, in case of neces-

sity, have recourse to the same means of redress and defence, as those of which former kings of France had made use in similar circumstances. He did not say this, however, to give the idea that it was his intention to refuse due obedience to the Holy See, although he had the independence of the Gallican Church very much at heart.

The ambassador thereupon received in the name of the Synod, through the promotor of the Council, the reply that he would receive a carefully considered answer to his declaration at the next public session, on October 11th. It was pointed out that, in the meantime, no prejudice against the Council and its continuation should be deduced from anything the French ambassador might have done.¹

On September 7th Paul Gregorianozi, Bishop of Agram, had arrived in Trent as second ambassador of King Ferdinand, and Guillaume de Poitiers as third representative of Charles V. for the provinces of Flanders.² As no further details with regard to the immediate intentions of the Emperor, especially concerning his journey to the Netherlands, had been made public, fears arose as to the continuation of the Council, while the reaction which the war about Parma was exercising on the Synod was steadily growing more apparent. On September 24th Bertano was able to report to Rome that the Emperor had postponed his proposed journey to the Netherlands for the present. Charles V. then repaired to Innsbruck, where he arrived at the beginning of November. He formed this resolution expressly with a view to the Council.³

Those who were assembled in Trent had at once resumed their activities after the session of September 1st. Already on the following day, ten articles concerning the Eucharist,

¹ Cf. RAYNALDUS, 1551, n. 28 *seq.*; LE PLAT, IV., 236 *seq.*, 238 *seq.*, 249 *seq.*; letter of S. de Selve in RIBIER, II., 352 *seq.*; PALLAVICINI, II, 17; MAYNIER, 611 *seq.*; BAGUENAUT DE PUCHESSE in the *Rev. des quest. hist.*, VII., (1869), 48 *seq.*; ROMIER, 40.

² MASSARELLI, 243 *seq.*

³ Cf. *Nuntiaturberichte*, XII., 72 n., 76, 86 *seq.*; DRUFFEL, I., 760.

taken from the writings of Luther and the Swiss reformers, were laid before the theologians of the Council for examination. A Congregation of twenty-four eminent theologians, among them the Jesuits, Lainez and Salmeron, sent by the Pope, and the Dominican, Melchior Cano, delegated by the Emperor, immediately took the work in hand. Their deliberations lasted from the 8th until the 16th of September, and were then continued with the same thoroughness by the fathers of the Council in nine General Congregations, from the 21st until the 30th of September. The theologians were enjoined to base their reasons on the Holy Scriptures, on Apostolic tradition, on lawful Councils, on the Fathers of the Church, on the Constitutions of the Popes and on the consensus of the universal Church. In so doing they were to avoid all prolixity, as well as all unnecessary discussions and contentious disputation. The Legate, Crescenzi, especially urged that they should limit themselves to a clear setting forth of the errors and not venture on theological sarcasm. During the deliberations the questions of the chalice for the laity and of children's communion were minutely discussed.¹

After the views of the religious innovators, grouped together in ten articles, had been discussed from all points of view and minutely examined, a commission of eight prelates was appointed in the General Congregation of September 30th, who, in conjunction with the Legate, were to refute these views in concisely framed Canons. The work of the commission reached the General Congregation on October 6th and was considered by the fathers of the Council on the following days. Eleven of these Canons were, after repeated remodelling, approved of by the latter; two others, already prepared, dealing with communion under both kinds, were, in accordance

¹ Cf. RAYNALDUS, 1551, n. 39; LE PLAT, IV., 258 *seq.*; THEINER, Acta, I., 488 *seq.*; MASSARELLI, 243; PALLAVICINI, 12, 1 *seq.* In order to realise the high opinion in which Lainez was held at Trent, cf. POLANCO, II., 250, 253; ASTRAIN, I., 552 *seq.*, where the description of Ribadeneira and Orlandini is corrected. Concerning M. Cano at Trent, see Katholik, 1880, I. 409 *seq.*

with the wish of the Emperor, postponed, in view of the expected arrival of the Protestants. Conformably to a proposal of the Bishop of Castellamare, a dogmatic decree in eight chapters, concerning the Holy Eucharist, and proportionate to the importance of the subject, was prefixed to the Canons. Besides these dogmatic questions, matters of reform were also treated, which had been partly dealt with in the first period of the Council, but were not yet settled. A General Congregation of October 10th sanctioned, for the following day, the publication of the dogmatic decree concerning the Holy Eucharist, the eleven Canons and a reform decree which, in eight chapters, dealt mainly with the guarantee of the authority of the bishops in their sees, their jurisdiction, the increasing difficulties attending their citation to Rome, the procedure in appealing to the Pope, and similar matters relating to the settlement of the ecclesiastical government of the Church. In accordance with a proposal of the Legate, it was then decided that the definition of the postponed articles dealing with the chalice for the laity and the communion of children, concerning which the Protestants wished to be heard, should be put off until the next session but one, on January 25th, 1552. A letter of safe-conduct for the Protestants was at the same time presented and sanctioned.¹

On October 11th, 1551, the thirteenth Session of the Council, the third under Julius III.,² took place with unusual solemnity. The Bishop of Majorca, Giambattista Campeggio, celebrated High Mass and the Archbishop of Sassari preached in honour of the Most Holy Sacrament of the Altar. The mandate, dated August 1st, of the Elector Joachim II. of Brandenburg for his ambassadors, Christoph von der Strassen and Johann

¹ Concerning these preliminary negotiations, *cf.* THEINER, *Acta*, I., 519 *seqq.*, and PALLAVICINI, 12, 5 *seq.* Concerning the wish of Charles V., see Bertano's report from Augsburg of September 29, 1551, in the *Nuntiaturberichte*, XII., 85 *seq.* *Cf.* DE LEVA, V., 254 *seqq.*

² See THEINER, *Acta*, I., 530; RAYNALDUS, 1551, n. 41 *seq.*; VARGAS, *Lettres*, ed. Levassor, 125 *seq.*, 168 *seq.*; PALLAVICINI 12, 9.

Hoffmann, who appeared at this session, was now read. In this official document the Prince of Brandenburg designated the Pope as Most Holy Lord and Father in Christ, first Bishop of the Roman and Universal Church, and his most gracious lord, who had seen fit, with fatherly patience and love, to continue the Council begun at Trent, and had promised the Emperor that the religious strife which had broken out in Germany should be finally settled by him, and the holy peace of the Church and the tranquillity of Germany definitely restored. In the speech which he made before the Council in the name of his master, von der Strassen gave the assurance that Joachim II. would keep and defend all the decrees of the Council honourably, as beseemed a Christian Prince and an obedient son of the Catholic Church.¹ It is possible and indeed very probable, that this declaration was chiefly made by the Prince of Brandenburg with a view to mitigating the opposition of the Pope to the election of his son Frederick, a minor, to the archbishoprics of Magdeburg and Halberstadt. His declaration was, however, of great significance, and was greeted with much applause by the Council.² The publication of the Decrees and Canons prepared now took place.

In the Decree dealing with the Holy Eucharist, the Catholic doctrine concerning this, the greatest of the treasures of the Church, to the glorification of which Raphael had once, under the second Julius, created the immortal fresco of the Disputa, is set forth with admirable lucidity.

Although Our Saviour, so teaches the Council, in His natural existence, is always at the right hand of the Father in heaven, He is still, in His substance, present in many places in a sacramental manner. This presence, under the appearances of bread and wine, is a true, real and actual presence. By the consecration, the bread and wine are changed in their essence into the Body and Blood of Christ, so that only the appearances

¹ See RAYNALDUS, 1551, n. 41 *seq.*; LE PLAT, IV., 264 *seq.*; Nuntiaturberichte, XII., 83 n. (the date October 6 is an error).

² Cf. PASTOR, Reunionsbestrebungen, 435 *seq.*

remain. This change of essence is rightly and fittingly called Transubstantiation. The Church has always believed that immediately after the consecration, Christ Our Lord is present, with body and soul, with Godhead and manhood, under the appearances of bread and wine, and also in every particle of the same. Utterly false is the assertion that Christ is only present in the Holy Sacrament as a sign or image, or that only His power or virtue are contained therein; it is further specially emphasized that Christ is not only present at the moment of participation, but also before and afterwards, and is therefore to be adored in the Blessed Sacrament. Concerning the preparation for communion, the Council expressly declares that no one conscious of having committed mortal sin, must dare to approach the Holy Sacrament without having previously confessed; with regard to the effects, the Council teaches that the Holy Eucharist blots out our daily venial sins and preserves us from mortal sin, that it is a food for our souls, and the pledge of a future life, so that we should often partake of this Bread of the Angels.

At the close of this eventful session, at which, in addition to the three presidents, Cardinal Madruzzo, the three ecclesiastical Electors, five archbishops, thirty-four bishops, three abbots, five generals of Orders, forty-eight theologians, as well as the ambassadors of Charles V., Ferdinand I. and the Elector Joachim II. took part, the answer of the Council to the King of France was read. The assembly, in this document, expressed their pained astonishment and regret that difficulties should be laid in their way by the French king. It repudiated the accusation that it did not serve the general interests of the Church, but individual political purposes. The ambassador of Henry II. could look after French interests, and should the French bishops appear, which they were once more earnestly requested to do, they would, both on their own account, and on that of their king, meet with an honourable and friendly reception; should they, however, neglect their duty, the Council would, nevertheless, remain a General Council. The king was, therefore, again earnestly admonished not to give way to his personal displeasure,

but to put the advantage of the Church before any other consideration.¹

On October 15th the Legate laid twelve articles on the Sacrament of Penance, and four on the Sacrament of Extreme Unction before the Council, as matter for its future work ; these had been drawn from the writings of the leading Protestant theologians. The theologians of the Council worked most assiduously, discussing these questions three hours in the morning and three in the afternoon, every day from the 20th until the 30th of October, and minutely deliberating on everything concerning the subjects in question, which appeared of importance to the controversialists. The result of these conferences, which were carried through with incredible assiduity and the greatest devotion, was laid before the General Congregation on November 5th, which deliberated on it in fourteen sessions until November 24th. On November 21st, a reform decree, containing fifteen chapters, had also been laid before the fathers, which was discussed in the General Congregation of the 23rd. The result of these deliberations, which were conducted with the most scrupulous care, were twelve dogmatic chapters on the Sacraments of Penance and Extreme Unction, and nineteen Canons for the condemnation of the teaching of the reformers with regard to these Sacraments.²

With regard to the Sacrament of Penance, the Council teaches that it was instituted by Christ in the form of a judgment-seat, in accordance with the words of St. John, and that it is necessary, as a means of again becoming reconciled to God, for everyone who has committed a mortal sin. Three acts are required from the penitent : Contrition, Confession, and Satisfaction. Contrition is defined as the sorrow of the soul and hatred of the sin committed, added to the intention

¹ See RAYNALDUS, 1551, n. 34 *seq.* ; LE PLAT, IV., 266 *seqq.*

² Cf. RAYNALDUS, 1551, n. 53 *seq.* ; THEINER, Acta. I., 531 *seq.* ; LE PLAT, IV, 272 *seq.* ; PALLAVICINI, 12, 10 *seq.* Concerning the deliberations on reform cf. MAYNIER, 669 *seq.* ; see also POSTINA, Billick, 119, where there is testimony to the zeal of the theologians. Cf. further GULIK, 153 *seq.* concerning the activity of Gropper.

of no more offending God. By Confession, which is ordained by God, the Church demands nothing further from the penitent than that he should, after a diligent and exact examination of his conscience, confess everything he remembers by which he has grievously offended God. The power of giving absolution is possessed by every priest validly ordained, even should he be in a state of mortal sin, who possesses either ordinary or delegated jurisdiction. Absolution is no mere declaration that the sins are forgiven, but is an official act, in which the priest gives sentence, as if he were a judge. With regard to Satisfaction, it is emphasized that the punishment is not fully remitted with the sin ; through the penance which the priest imposes, the power of the merits and satisfaction of Christ is in no way lessened or obscured. In dealing with Extreme Unction the Council emphasizes above all things that it is a real and intrinsic Sacrament, instituted by Jesus Christ, and refers in justification thereof to the words of St. James.

The reform decree, which contained, besides an introduction, fourteen chapters, was drawn up principally with the intention of removing the difficulties which bishops encounter in punishing bad ecclesiastics, as well as of taking measures that priests, especially those occupied with the care of souls, should not lead wicked lives ; a clerical and seemly mode of dress was prescribed, and certain abuses in the bestowal of benefices combated. All these decrees were published on November 25th, at the fourteenth Session of the Council, and the fourth under Julius III.¹

The date of the next session was fixed for January 25th, 1552. The Catholic doctrine concerning the Sacrifice of the Mass and the ordination of priests was to be published in this session in a dogmatic decree. Ten articles which attacked the Sacrifice of the Mass were then again taken from the writ-

¹ The three Presidents, Cardinal Madruzzo, the Electors of Cologne, Trêves, and Mayence, six other archbishops, forty bishops, five abbots, the General of the Augustinians, six procurators, fifty-one theologians and the ambassadors were present. Cf. THEINER, *Acta*, I., 601 ; RAYNALDUS, 1551, n. 56 seq. ; PALLAVICINI, 12, 14.

ings of the Protestant theologians, and six directed against the sacramental character of Holy Orders. These were collected and were in the hands of the theologians on December 3rd; among them were two Germans, Johannes Gropper and Eberhard Billick, who distinguished themselves; they had come to Trent with the Elector of Cologne. The theologians deliberated in twenty-nine conferences from the 7th until the 29th of December. The result of their deliberations was handed to the fathers of the Council on January 3rd, 1552, who dealt with it from the 5th until the 13th of January in thirteen General Congregations. On January 14th the final redaction was entrusted to a commission of eighteen prelates, who drew up four chapters of instruction and thirteen Canons concerning the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass, and three chapters of instruction and eight Canons concerning Holy Orders. These were laid before the General Congregation for final approval on the 18th, 20th and 21st of January.¹

The publication of these Decrees did not take place, however, either in the session immediately following, or even during the second period of the Council.

While the representative of Charles V. at Trent was hoping, at the end of 1551, that the Council would finish its work in two further sessions,² the Elector Maurice of Saxony was secretly planning a wide-spread conspiracy to cut the Emperor "to the heart." The traitor outwardly kept up the appearance of favouring the Council.³

Neither the Emperor nor the Pope had any idea of the events which were in course of preparation. When, at the end of 1551, the Prince-Electors of Mayence and Trêves prepared to leave the city of the Council, on account of the trouble in Germany, the Emperor, as well as Julius III., protested with great energy against this step. The Princes were thereby

¹ Cf. THEINER, *Acta*, I., 602 *seqq.*, 635 *seqq.*; LE PLAT, IV., 334 *seqq.*, 386 *seqq.*, 405 *seq.*; KNÖPFLE in the *Freiburger Kirchenlexikon*, XI.², 2079 *seq.*

² F. de Toledo to Charles V., dated Trent, December 25, 1551, in DÖLLINGER, *Beiträge*, I., 177 *seq.*

³ Cf. JANNSSEN-PASTOR, III. 17⁻¹⁸, 719.

prevailed upon to remain for the time being, partly because they had no answer to make to the letter written to them by the Emperor, in which he pointed out the groundlessness of their fears, and also, perhaps, so that the Protestants, who had at last arrived, could not say that their appearance had put the Electors to flight.¹

While these dangers, so threatening to the Council, were, for the time being, surmounted, other difficulties arose which made it impossible to continue the work of the Synod.

On October 22nd, 1551, the two ambassadors of the Duke of Wurtemberg had arrived. Johann Sleidan, the representative of the cities of Strasbourg, Esslingen, Reutlingen, Ravensburg, Biberach and Lindau² followed on November 11th. The hopes of an amicable arrangement soon proved vain, as these persons refused to pay the Legate and nuncios the customary civility of a visit. The representatives of the Pope chose to ignore this rudeness, for Julius III. had enjoined on them to place charity before dignity, and to bear all insults with patience, and, as far as possible, and so long as no disadvantage for the Church and religion ensued, to accommodate themselves to the requests of the Protestants, as it is never a disgrace for a father to bear patiently the undutifulness of a child, in order to bring him back to the right path.³ On January 9th, 1552, Wolfgang Koller and Leopold Badhorn, the representatives of the most powerful of the Protestant dynasties of the Empire, the Prince-Elector, Maurice of Saxony, arrived.⁴ They also avoided all relations with the

¹ See MAURENBRECHER, 154* *seq.*, 158* *seq.*, 160* ; RAYNALDUS, 1551, n. 64 and 65 ; Nuntiaturberichte, XII., 118 *seq.*, 124 *seq.*, 129, 133, 141 *seq.*, 148 *seq.* ; DRUFFEL, II., 7.

² Cf. DE LEVA, V., 279 *seq.* The instructions for the Wurtemberg ambassadors in SATTLER, *Gesch. Württembergs*, IV., Doc. 30 ; cf. DRUFFEL, I., 837. The mandate of Strasbourg for Sleidan in LE PLAT, IV., 278 *seq.* Concerning the attitude of Strasbourg, see BAUMGARTEN, 159 *seqq.* ; *ibid.* the report of Sleidan from Trent.

³ See PALLAVICINI, 12, 15, 2.

⁴ Their instructions of December 13, 1551, in DRUFFEL, I., 859.

representatives of the Pope, and dealt only with the ambassadors of the Emperor. To these they declared that a new letter of safe-conduct must be drawn up for the theologians to be sent by their master, in the form in which it was formerly issued for the Bohemians by the Council of Basle. They further insisted that the Council must suspend its work until the arrival of the said theologians, when all the former decisions must be once more discussed. The decrees of Constance and Basle concerning the superiority of Councils over the Pope were to be confirmed, and Cardinals, bishops and other members of the Council were to be released from the oath which bound them to Julius III. The Wurtemberg ambassadors demanded, in a similar manner, that the Council should annul all the decisions already arrived at, and that judges should be appointed for the settlement of religious disputes, who were not so partial as were the bishops.¹

As several of these demands had for their object the complete subversion of the existing system of the government of the Church, their very presentation made any prospect of agreement an impossibility.² The presidents of the Council, and above all the Cardinal-Legate, Crescenzi, recognized this clearly, although the Imperialists allowed themselves to be deluded with vain hopes. As the old opposition concerning the question of reform, which had already on several occasions caused dissension between Crescenzi and the Spanish-Imperial party, was always growing more acute, very lively scenes took

¹ See LE PLAT, IV., 464 *seqq.*; *cf. ibid.* 460 *seq.*; and Nuntiaturberichte, XII., 159, n. 3. The first as well as the second letter of safe-conduct of the Council of Trent, and that of the Council of Basle, in BRENZ, *Syntagma eorum quae nomine Christophori ducis Virtemb. in synodo Tridentina per legatos eius acta sunt*, 99 *seq.*

² In order to judge of these demands, a part of which undoubtedly could not be granted by the Catholics, see PALLAVICINI, 12, 15, and among moderns, especially BUCHOLTZ, in his detailed rescension of Ranke's German history, in the *Wiener Jahrb. der Lit.*, CXV. (1846), 113 *seq.*; *cf. also* KNÖPFLE in the *Freiburger Kirchlexikon*, XI., ² 2080.

place.¹ In order to be just to Crescenzi we must remember that the instructions given him by Julius III. from the very beginning, were to the effect that he was not to enter into any negotiations with the Protestants, unless they were ready to submit to the decisions of the Pope, as lawful Head of the Church summoning the Council.² In order to conciliate them as far as possible, the Legate resolved to yield to the urgent requests of the Imperialists, and to hear the Protestants before the assembled General Congregation, although they had not made any such declaration. "Even when we have reason to fear," writes the second president, Pighino, on January 23rd, 1552, "that we are being imposed upon, the Church, as anxious Mother, must repulse no one, but must show everyone how to approach her, and hold the way open, and remove all grounds for evading and remaining away from the Council." The assembly was agreeable to this, but secured themselves against any disadvantageous consequences which might follow on their complaisance.³

In the Congregation held in the forenoon of January 24th, the Wurtemberg ambassadors were received. They produced the confession of faith, drawn up at Brenz, and announced that their Duke would send theologians for the defence of the tenets set forth therein; it was, however, his desire that arbitrators should be appointed, as the bishops belonged to a party, and could, therefore, arrive at no definite decision; the Council, moreover, was not to be continued in the sense that the decrees already published were to be accepted as fixed; as, up till now, only one side had been heard, these decrees must now be annulled. The Congregation thereupon answered that they would, after due consideration, reply to these demands.⁴

¹ Cf. the very one-sided account in DE LEVA, V., 285 *seq.*

² See RAYNALDUS, 1551, n. 11. De LEVA pays absolutely no attention to these instructions.

³ See THEINER, Acta, I., 648 *seq.*; LE PLAT, IV., 417 *seq.*

⁴ See THEINER, Acta, I., 648 *seq.*; LE PLAT, IV., 418 *seqq.*; letter of Lippomano in the Corpo dipl. Port. VII., 111 *seq.*; PALLAVICINI, 12, 15; MAYNIER, 720 *seq.*; Nuntiaturberichte,

The Saxon ambassadors were to be received by the Congregation in the afternoon of the same day. Acceptance was refused to the so-called Recapitulation of the Augsburg Confession, composed by Melancthon, as this frankly constituted a point-blank declaration of war against the Council.¹ The speech,² moreover, in which the Saxon ambassador, Badhorn, set forth the demands he had already laid before the ambassadors of the Emperor, was anything but conciliatory. He did not shrink from telling the Catholics quite openly that in their case only "an appearance of religion" was to be found among them!³ Badhorn, in accordance with his instructions, laid the greatest importance on the drafting of a letter of safe-conduct which would be conformable with the wishes of his master. This must be drawn up exactly in the same form as that granted by the Council of Basle to the Bohemians. It was a singular request, for the Basle letter of safe-conduct in no way contained the demands upon which the Protestants now laid the greatest stress, namely that religious disputes should be settled by the Scriptures alone, and that the reformers should be given decisive votes in the Council. In his speeches, Badhorn contested a declaration which he erroneously believed to have emanated from the Council of Constance, that, in the

XII., 159 n. 3. Concerning the *Confessio Wirtemberg.* see SCHNURRER, *Beitr. zur württemb. Kirchengesch.* (1798), 214 *seq.*, and HEPPE, *Bekenninisschriften*, Cassel, 1855, 491 *seqq.*; *cf.* also HARTMANN-JÄGER, *Brenz*, II., 198 *seqq.*

¹ Opinion of K. A. MENZEL (III., 381); *cf.* PASTOR, *Reunionsbestrebungen*, 431 *seq.* Concerning the "Repetitio confess. August." (*Corp. Ref.* XXVIII, 328 *seq.*) see also the criticisms in the *Zeitschr. für Kirchengesch.*, II., 305, n. 3.

² Copied in RAYNALDUS, 1552, n. 15 and LE PLAT, IV., 464 *seq.* Concerning the criticism see especially PALLAVICINI, 12, 15, 7 *seq.* The statement of Malvendas, which MAYNIER (726 n.) has already drawn upon, is very remarkable.

³ DE LEVA (V., 290) finds, notwithstanding this, that the attitude of the Saxons was "in forma calma e rispettosa!" *Cf.* on the other hand the sharp criticism of the contemporary Lippomano in the *Corpo dipl. Port.*, VII., 112.

case of heretics, it was not necessary to observe the letter of safe-conduct.

In glaring contrast to this attack on the Council of Constance, was the fact that Badhorn enthusiastically defended¹ the uncatholic principle of the superiority of the Council over the Pope in matters of faith, which had been brought forward by the same Council, but had not become law. Perhaps he knew that this principle still had adherents among Catholics, and even among the fathers of the Council of Trent. Badhorn quite disregarded the fact that Luther had considered the Council of Constance as invalid, and had repudiated as new-fangled its authentic decrees. The demand that the bishops should be released from their oath to the Pope, the ambassador based on the need of reform in the Curia. He openly denied all authority on the part of the Pope, which amounted to a complete overthrow of the whole system of government of the Church, as it had existed until now. Badhorn claimed the highest authority for his party ; it alone should decide how far the present Church differed from the old. All the questions concerning Faith already defined by the Council should be discussed all over again ; this had been the idea of the Diet of Augsburg, when the continuation of the Council of Trent had been called for in the name of all the States. Such a new discussion was necessary, as the Elector of Saxony was convinced that many errors were contained in those articles, especially in that concerning Justification, which must be rectified by the Scriptures. The final settlement of these questions must be made by the judicial decision of all the Christian nations, whose representatives had not taken part in the earlier discussions, and without whom the Council could only be called a separatist assembly and not a General Council.

If one were to proceed on the principle that the absence of several validly summoned members was sufficient ground for questioning the authority of a legitimate Council, there would hardly have been a Synod in history, at which the full attendance might not have been called in question. Badhorn did

¹ Cf. our conclusions in Vol. I. of this work, 198 *seq.*

away with all doubt as to what this " free, Christian, general " Council was to do ; by expressly and repeatedly emphasizing the principle that in the settlement of religious disputes the Holy Scriptures were to form the only standard, he shows clearly that the Protestants demanded, as a matter of course, that the Council should regard the new doctrines introduced by them as proven truths, concerning which in actuality no dispute could arise. The Congregation restricted itself, in replying to the Saxon representatives, to the same answer which those of Wurtemberg had received.¹

After the departure of the ambassadors from the assembly, a long discussion began, at which the representatives of Charles V. and Ferdinand I. were also present. The old opposition, which had repeatedly shown itself on previous occasions, between the strictly ecclesiastical course pursued by the Legate, and that of the Spanish-Imperialist party, now again stood out in strong contrast. In order to obtain a perfectly clear view of the position, Crescenzi wished that an express declaration against the superiority of the Council over the Pope should be issued. This proposal, however, did not gain a majority, although the Spanish-Imperialists were just as far from gaining a victory with regard to the question they had most at heart. Charles V. had insisted from the first, that the principal task of the Council was not to consist in the definition of doctrines, but in the preparation of statutes of reform. The Spaniards appeared to think that the time had now come to proceed without delay in this sense. They hoped to please the Catholics as well as the Protestants by this means, and, at the same time, to carry through a number of their own plans with regard to ecclesiastical matters. Crescenzi, however continued to maintain that, as formerly, dogma and reform must still be dealt with side by side. In order, however, to do everything possible on his part, the Legate finally declared himself ready to comply with the wish of the Protestants, and allow that the decrees already prepared concerning the Sacri-

¹ See THEINER, *Acta*, I., 649 *seq.*, and *Nuntiaturberichte*, XII., 159 n. 3 ; *cf.* PALLAVICINI, 12, 15, 7 *seq.*

fice of the Mass and Holy Orders, should be postponed until March 19th, and that a new letter of safe-conduct should be drawn up in the required form.

The Congregation decided in this sense, and also ordered that the material concerning the Sacrament of Matrimony should be prepared, so that the deliberations of the Council should not be suspended.¹

At the fifteenth Session of the Council, held on January 25th, the decree of adjournment, as well as the new letter of safe-conduct, finally agreed upon after repeated negotiations between the Legate and the Imperialists, were made public.² This letter afforded to all the Germans, and in particular to all the adherents of the Confession of Augsburg, the fullest security in coming to Trent, in staying there, in making proposals, in negotiating with the Council, in examining and giving expression to everything they desired, as well as in presenting every article in writing or by word of mouth, supporting the same with passages from the Scriptures and the Fathers, and upholding them with any arguments they pleased. They were also to have freedom in replying to objections of the Council, set forth by those who were appointed by the Synod to carry on discussions or friendly disputations, with a complete avoidance of invective and recrimination. This was all to be done for the purpose of dealing with the questions in dispute in accordance with the Holy Scriptures, the tradition of the Apostles, the authentic Councils, the consensus of the Catholic Church, and the authority of the Fathers. The Protestants were finally assured that they would in no way be punished on account of religion, or of the past or future proceedings of the Council in connection therewith; that they would be at perfect liberty to return home when it pleased them; that they could leave the city and again return to it at

¹ Cf. *ibid.* 12, 15, 16-18, and the reports of the Imperial secretary, F. de Vargas, in his letters, *ed.* LEVASSOR, 471 *seqq.*, 492 *seq.* These reports, which have been used by MAYNIER, (p. 726 *seq.*), are, however, obviously one-sided.

² See THEINER, *Acta*, I., 651; cf. VARGAS, *Lettres*, 487 *seq.*

their own discretion, as well as carry on communications when and where they pleased.¹

The representatives of the Elector Maurice were, however, not yet satisfied with this exhaustive letter of safe-conduct, drawn up in the most definite terms and handed to the Protestants on January 30th; they demanded a letter which agreed in every particular with that granted by the Council of Basle to the Bohemians. In spite of the representations made to them by the Imperial ambassadors, they only accepted the letter on the condition of being allowed to inform their master of it first.²

Even a man of such strong anti-papal views as Vargas, the Imperial agent, considered that in obtaining this new letter of safe-conduct, the Protestants had actually gained everything they demanded.³ If they, in spite of this, raised new difficulties, there could only be one explanation of such a proceeding, namely, the obstinacy of the Elector Maurice, who saw in the question of this letter, the best means of prolonging, through his theologians, the affair of the Council, until such a time as his further plans had developed or been frustrated.⁴

¹ See BUCHOLTZ, VI., 475 *seq.*

² See DRUFFEL, II., 78 *seq.* On the day after the session of the Council, thirty-three articles dealing with the Sacrament of Matrimony were laid before the theologians as a fresh subject for consideration. Their work, however, soon came to a standstill, a fact which the Spanish bishops deeply regretted. See MAYNIER, 737 *seq.*, where the reasons for the stoppage are given. That the attitude of the Protestants was partly the cause of this, *cf.* the dedication of the work of the theologian of the Council, Joh. Ant. Delphinus, *De matrimonio et caelibatu* (Camerini 1553), where the displeasure of those taking part in the Council at the behaviour of the reformers is freely expressed (see LAUCHERT in the *Zeitschr. für kath. Theologie*, 1910, 42). Concerning Delphinus, *cf.* also LAUCHERT, *Ital. Gegner Luthers*, 487 *seqq.* Bertano was also very much displeased at the postponement of the session; see *Nuntiaturberichte*, XII., 163 *seq.*

³ *Lettres*, ed. LEVASSOR, 487; *cf.* MAYNIER, 735.

⁴ See DRUFFEL, I., 843.

This Prince, influenced as he was by the purest self-interest, in whom " was neither a patriotic nor a religious thought to be found " had undoubtedly for the same reason frustrated the attempt to induce the Wittenberg and Leipsic theologians to come to an agreement with those of Wurtemberg and Strasbourg concerning a joint confession of faith to be laid before the Council,¹ which would have been of the greatest advantage to the Protestant cause.

The presidents of the Council had at once communicated the demands of the Protestants to Rome. It can easily be understood that Julius III. was indignant at these pretensions, which were directly aimed against his authority. He would also have been glad had a decided refusal, in keeping with the dignity of the Council, been given to these demands.² Meanwhile, Crescenzi could feel satisfied with the final decision of the Pope, for which the approval of the commission of Cardinals had been obtained.³ All further discussion of the three chimerical conditions : that the Council stood above the Pope, that the bishops should be freed from their oath, and that the decrees already decided on should be again dealt with, was forbidden.

The Bishop of Montefiascone, Achille de' Grassi, through whom Julius III. communicated his decision to the presidents of the Council, was instructed to announce in Trent, that an answer was to be given to the ambassadors of Wurtemberg and Saxony, so as to give them no ground for justifiable complaint, and to avoid the appearance of being unable to bring forward solid reasons for opposing their assertions. This answer was only to establish the jurisdiction and authority of the Council, and was not intended to irritate by offensive expressions, but to give evidence of fatherly love and the ardent wish to bring back to the Church those severed from

¹ LOSSEN in the *Allgem. Zeitung*, 1876, No. 24, who is fully in agreement with the above opinion of Druffel against Maurenbrecher and Ranke.

² *Nuntiaturberichte*, XII., lxx., 180.

³ *Ibid.* 180, n. 3.

it.¹ Grassi was instructed to proceed from Trent to the Emperor, and remonstrate with him concerning the behaviour of the Spaniards at the Council,² for these had adopted a course, with regard to the question of reform, which could lead to no real improvement in the ecclesiastical position.³ They claimed that the bestowal of almost all benefices was to be in the hands of national authorities, and the chapters to be brought into complete dependence on the bishops. Julius III., while emphasizing his honest intention of proceeding energetically concerning the question of reform, bitterly complained of such a limitation of the power granted him by God, and also deliberated on the matter with the Cardinals. They were all of the opinion that if the Papal authority were attacked under the pretence of a reform, energetic measures must be adopted against such a proceeding. The instructions for Achille de' Grassi (dated February 20th, 1552), contained the following sentence: "should, moreover, the reports current since yesterday in Rome, of an alliance between the French King and the Lutheran princes of Germany, and of a revolt of the latter against the Emperor, prove correct, then one can hardly see what good purpose the Council can serve, or of what use it can be, even should its continuance be possible."⁴

In consequence of the disquieting news from Germany, the Elector of Trêves had already left Trent on February 16th.⁵

¹ The instructions for Grassi of February 20, 1552, in RAYNALDUS, 1552, n. 18 *seq.* Cf. LE PLAT, IV., 534 *seq.*; PIEPER, 37, 154 *seq.*

² Julius III. to A. Perrenot, in RAYNALDUS, 1552, n. 17; LE PLAT, IV., 533 *seq.* The journey did not take place until after Crescenzi had come to an understanding with the Imperial ambassador; see *Nuntiaturberichte*, XII., 223.

³ That the opinion of PIEPER (p. 38) is justified, is shown elsewhere, as well as in the letter in the *Corpo dipl. Port.*, VII., 108.

⁴ See the letter of Julius III. to Cardinal Crescenzi of January 16, 1552, in PIEPER 38 *seq.*; *Nuntiaturberichte*, XII., lxxv. *seq.*, 363 *seqq.*

⁵ THEINER, *Acta*, I., 652; cf. RAYNALDUS, 1552, n. 2.

Eight days later the Emperor also thought that in the present position of affairs, the Electors would be better at home.¹ As the news from Germany was daily becoming more threatening, the Electors of Mayence and Cologne also left the seat of the Council on March 11th. Two days later the Saxon ambassadors left the town quite quietly in the early morning. On March 11th two new ambassadors of the Duke of Wurtemberg appeared in Trent, and on the 18th four Wurtemberg theologians, Brenz, Beuerlin, Heerbrandt and Vannius, as well as two from Strasbourg, Marbach and Söll. Negotiation with these proved quite hopeless.² It was clear that the Protestants, after having made an appearance, for a time, of submitting to the Council, now intended to refrain from any real participation in its deliberations.³ Even the Emperor was at last convinced that a profitable continuation of the Council under such difficulties was not to be thought of. On March 5th he therefore instructed his ambassadors to induce the Curia, in a diplomatic manner, to propose a suspension of the deliberations. When the Electors of Mayence and Cologne reached Innsbruck on their return journey, the Emperor declared that he was agreeable to a suspension. When he gave the nuncio, Bertano, assurances to the exactly opposite effect, on March 26th, it was only to

¹ To Queen Mary, February 24, 1552, in DRUFFEL, II., 151.

² Cf. THEINER, *Acta*, I., 653; *Nuntiatgeberichte*, XII., 233; PASTOR, *Reunionsbestrebungen*, 445; POSTINA, *Billick*, 123. F. Nausea died on February 6 in Trent. On March 5 three more ambassadors of the King of Portugal arrived in Trent. A dispute between them and the Hungarian ambassador concerning a question of precedence, was provisionally settled in the General Congregation of March 19. At the same time the next session was postponed until May 1, as the work had to be stopped on account of the fruitless waiting for the Protestants, who were still expected, and it was also desirable to await further developments with regard to the danger of war. THEINER, *Acta*, I., 652, 653 *seq.* RAYNALDUS, 1552, n. 25.

³ This is the opinion of MAURENBRECHER (p. 284).

avoid the appearance of the proposal having emanated from him.¹

The uncertainty as to what would now happen was soon brought to an end. News of the Elector Maurice's traitorous dealings with France against the Empire had already arrived in Rome in the last week of January, 1552, which dealings were actually taking place at a time when it was firmly believed, at the Imperial court at Innsbruck, that the Saxon theologians would soon appear in Trent.² Indeed, Melancthon did arrive in Nuremberg on January 22nd, while the private secretary of the Elector of Saxony went to Charles V. at Innsbruck to excuse the delay in the arrival of his master.³ The Emperor had not the slightest idea that all this was being done to deceive him, until Maurice had completed his preparations for war. By the middle of March the necessary preliminaries had been arranged, and the mask could be dropped. While Maurice and his fellow conspirators were beginning a predatory war on German territory, their French allies appeared on the western frontiers of the Empire.⁴

A correspondent of Cardinal Farnese tells us on March 20th, from Rome, that the whole of Germany was in arms, and any doubt as to the alliance between the French King and the Protestant princes could no longer exist.⁵ It therefore appeared all the more incredible to the ambassadors at the Curia that the Emperor had taken no measures to oppose the warlike

¹ Cf. *ibid.*, 283 *seq.*, 161 *seq.*; LANZ, III., 136 *seq.*; Nuntiaturberichte, XII., lxvi. *seq.*

² Cf. Nuntiaturberichte, XII., lxxi., 153 n. 4.

³ Melancthon remained until March 10 in Nuremberg, awaiting orders from his Elector; see PASTOR, Reunionsbestrebungen, 437 *seq.*, 443.

⁴ See JANNSEN-PASTOR, III.¹⁷⁻¹⁸, 724 *seq.*, 739 *seq.*

⁵ *Noi vediamo che tutta la Germania è in armi a l'impensata. May God help us. Le cose che si dicono sono tali ch'io non oso scriverle; unum est che la lega tra Francesi et Mauritio et gli 2 marchesi di Brandenburg è chiara. *Nove da Roma of March 20, 1552 (Carte Farnes. in the State Archives, Naples). Cf. also Cocciano's letter of March 26 in DRUFFEL, II., 295.

preparations of his enemies ;¹ no one there understood the masterpiece of hypocrisy and cunning with which Maurice had ensnared his benefactor.

It seemed certain that to continue the Council in the present state of affairs would be highly dangerous. The Pope, however, in spite of the alarming news, still hesitated to suspend it until the middle of April.² The decision was made imperative by the news that Augsburg had fallen into the hands of the enemies of Charles V., whereby the safety of Trent was very gravely threatened. Julius III., after deliberation with the Cardinals, only decided on the suspension on April 15th, to obviate the danger of the Council dissolving itself. The courier who brought the brief in question to the Legate, arrived in Trent on April 20th.³ It was, however, not yet made public, as the presidents considered it wiser to allow the suspension to be decided by the Synod, in order to avoid irritating disputes with regard to the relations of the Council with the Pope. This took place in the General Congregation of April 24th, in which, indeed, some of the Spanish prelates opposed the suspension ; a majority, however, was found for the proposal of Cardinal Madruzzo, who suggested a suspension for two years. A commission of seven prelates was entrusted with the drafting of the decree. A proposal made, in accordance with the wish of the Pope, by the second president, to send a number of the members of the Council to Rome, to co-operate there at further reform work, was negatived on April 26th.⁴

The decree of suspension was published on April 28th, at the sixteenth session of the Council. Twelve prelates, mostly

¹ See the *letter of Ipp. Capilupi to Cardinal E. Gonzaga, dated Rome, March 29, 1552 (Gonzaga Archives, Mantua).

² It is therefore erroneous when Ranke says (Päpste, I., 180) : " Julius III. hastened to decree the suspension."

³ Cf. Nuntiaturberichte, XII., lxxvii. seq., 302 ; RAYNALDUS, 1552, n. 25 ; Carte Strozzi., I., 393 seq.

⁴ See THEINER, Acta, I., 655 seq. ; RAYNALDUS, 1552, n. 26 ; cf. DE LEVA, V., 356 seq. ; Nuntiaturberichte, XII., lxxviii.

Spanish, had protested against it.¹ These remained alone in the city of the Council, but were compelled to make a very hasty exit when, through the capture of the Ehrenberg mountain pass by Maurice of Saxony, the Emperor, who was at that time ill with gout, had to flee from Innsbruck on the evening of May 19th. The Legate, Cardinal Crescenzi, who had been ill since March 25th, withdrew from Trent to Verona on May 26th, where he died on the 28th.²

¹ See THEINER, *Acta*, I., 659; RAYNALDUS, 1552, n. 27, 28; *cf.* LE PLAT, IV., 545 *seq.*; PALLAVICINI, 13, 3; MAYNIER, 750 *seq.*

² See THEINER, *Acta*, I., 660; FIRMANUS, 497 *seq.*; HOSII *epist.*, II., 211. The body of the Cardinal was first buried in the Pantheon in Rome, and then in S. Maria degli Angeli; see FIRMANUS, 499, and FORCELLA, XI., 48.

CHAPTER V.

WAR IN UPPER AND CENTRAL ITALY.—JULIUS III.'S EFFORTS FOR PEACE.—CONCLUSION OF HIS PONTIFICATE AND HIS DEATH.

THERE is preserved in the Vienna archives a confidential letter of Charles V., dated April 20th, 1551, to his ambassador in Rome, Diego Mendoza, in which he openly declares that his procedure in the dispute about Parma has for its object to keep Julius III. completely in the channels of his own policy. The ambassador is, therefore, enjoined to fan the Pope's anger against his disobedient vassal and his protector Henry II. to red heat by every means in his power.¹

It did not, however, escape the Pope that in the matter of Parma, they wanted to bring him into complete subjection to the Emperor, but he also recognized the dangers which threatened his interests on the part of France, which faced him with the menace of a schism, if he proceeded against Ottavio Farnese. It was really like "a great labyrinth" in which it was easy to lose the right path.² Hence the vacillation of the Pope and his repeated efforts, even at the last moment, to avoid the fateful struggle.³ All these endeavours, however, proved vain. Julius III. had not decision of character enough to withstand the importunities of Charles V.,

¹ LANZ, I., 177, with erroneous date ; *cf.* DRUFFEL, I., 622 ; II., 390.

² * "Aca no se habla en otra cosa si no en esta de Parma, en un gran laberinto se han metido estos señores S.S.^d me parece que lo toma de veras." Card. Pacheco to Card. Madruzzo, dated Rome, April 9, 1551 (Vice-regal Archives, Innsbruck).

³ *Cf. Supra* p. 97.

Ferrante Gonzaga, and Diego Mendoza, and the eager desire for war on the part of Giovan Battista del Monte. "The right," he said to Ippolito Capilupi, "is on our side, as well as the support of the Emperor, who will restore Parma to the Church,"¹ and in this manner he rashly and imprudently resolved on war.

On May 22nd, 1551, Julius III. signed the document by which Ottavio Farnese was declared to have forfeited his fief, and communicated it to the Cardinals in a secret consistory.² Nevertheless, on the following day, the Florentine ambassador, Buonanni, reports that the Pope was still hoping for an arrangement, although no one else in Rome now considered it possible.³ Julius actually agreed to the proposals of Ottavio regarding the exchange of Parma for Camerino, which he had at first repudiated; in the consistory of June 10th he invested Farnese with Camerino, and assured him a yearly revenue of 8000 scudi.⁴ This complaisance also proved vain, for Ottavio

¹ Report of Ipp. Capilupi to F. Gonzaga of May 22, 1551, in CHIESI. 223. Concerning the urging on of Julius III., who really had leanings towards Farnese, see a characteristic assertion of A. Caro in RONCHINI, *Lett. d'uomini ill.*, 330. G. Ricci says in his **Memorie* (Ricci archives, Rome) quite candidly: "la guerra di Parma e Mirandola ordita per D. Diego di Mendoza."

² *Sententia declarat. privat. contra O. Farnesium*, dat. XI. Cal. Junii, 1551. A contemporary impression in the Rossiana Library, Vienna; a copy in the *collection of Contelorius (see *infra* 131, n. 1) 21, 22; Spanish translation in the Archives of the Spanish Embassy, Rome.

³ "Il papa credo che sia solo a sperar che le cose di Parma possino o habbino a comporsi." *Letter of Buonanni, dated Rome, June 1, 1551 (State Archives, Florence). Cf. also the letter of Card. Medici in CAMPORI, *Lettere*, 17 *seqq.*

⁴ See *Acta Consist.* (Consistorial Archives of the Vatican); *letter of Julius III. to Dandino, of June 10, 1551 (Secret Archives of the Vatican, F. Borghese, II., 465 p. 61 *seq.*), utilised in the *Nuntiaturberichte*, XII., n. 35; *report of Serristori of June 10, 1551, as well as Card. Medici's letter of June 20, 1551, in DE LFVA, V., 154. Cf. the instructions for Grassi in WEISS, *Pap. de Granvelle*, III., 579-80, and PIEPER, 23.

Farnese, who had full confidence in the alliance he had concluded with Henry II. on May 27th, was resolved that the matter should be decided by an appeal to arms. On June 12th his adherents invaded the States of the Church from Mirandola, reduced Crevalcore, and devastated the district of Bologna. The Papal troops advanced against them, fought a victorious battle, and then joined the Imperial troops under Ferrante Gonzaga; the war had therefore now begun.¹ It was all too soon proved, however, that the Pope did not possess the firmness necessary to deal with the rapidly succeeding events with consistent resolution, or to direct them into suitable courses.² In Rome itself the war had been highly unpopular from the beginning.³ The shrewdest men in the Curia, Cardinals Morone and Crescenzi, knew only too well that the Pope was not equal to such extraordinary circumstances, and had, therefore, earnestly dissuaded him from entering on such a dangerous and pernicious struggle,

¹ Concerning the war about Parma, the different stages of which are of little interest, *cf.* ADRIANI, VIII., 3 *seqq.*; SEGNI, XIII.; GIUL. GOSELLINI in the *Miscell. di stor. Ital.*, XVII., 141 *seqq.*; *Mem. stor. d. città di Mirandola II.*, Mirandola, 1874; BALAN, VI., 420-1; BALAN, *Assedi della Mirandola*, 25 *seqq.*; DE LEVA in the *Riv. stor. Ital.* I., 632 *seqq.*; VIII., 713-4; and Carlo quinto V., 113 *seqq.*, 202 *seqq.*; CHIESI, 224 *seqq.*; ANDREA DA MOSTO in *Quellen und Forschungen des Preuss. Histor. Inst.* VI., 100-1; COURTEAULT, *Blaise de Monluc*, 190 *seqq.* BOSELLI treats of a poem about the Parma war in the review *Per l'arte*, XV., 5-6. The work of F. Contelorius: **Bellum Parmense sub Julio III. gestum* (Cod. Barb. XXXII., 183, now 2392 of the Vatican Library; *cf.* *Arch. Rom.* II., 294; a copy in the Communal Library, Piacenza, MS. Landi) gives, besides a collection of official documents (especially on pp. 39-40; see also 61 *seqq.*) a full statement about the war. De Turre, *Bellum Parmense*, MS. of the Palat. Lib. in Parma, is still unpublished.

² The opinion of PIEPER, 23.

³ See Niccolò da Ponte's report of May 30, 1551, in the *Miscell. di stor. Ital.* XVII., 160.

for the successful issue of which his resources were wholly inadequate.¹

Julius III. had, on June 6th, 1551, entrusted the supreme command of the expedition against Parma to the Viceroy of Milan, Ferrante Gonzaga, with full confidence in the support of the Emperor.² The Papal troops were nominally commanded by the nephews of the Pope, Giovan Battista del Monte and Vincenzo de' Nobili ; in reality, however, the command was in the hands of Camillo Orsini and Alessandro Vitelli. Cardinal de' Medici,³ whose brother, the Marquis of Marignano, was leader of the Imperial troops under Ferrante Gonzaga, was appointed legate with the army on June 7th. In the States of the Church all enrolment under foreign princes was forbidden ;⁴ Cardinals Alessandro and Ranuccio Farnese received on June 16th strict orders to return at once to Rome ; the Emperor deprived them of their rich benefices, also withdrawing from Ottavio his fiefs in Lombardy and Naples.⁵

¹ Serristori mentions letters of Crescenzi, which urged the ending of the war, and thus excited the Pope, although they did not make him change his mind ; see *report of September 18, 1551 (State Archives, Florence). Concerning Morone, see Lett. di princ., 165 *seq.*

² *Brief of June 6, 1551. Arm. 41, t. 60, n. 432. (Secret Archives of the Vatican).

³ *Brief of June 7, 1551, *Ibid.* n. 433. Card Medici was recalled on November 28, 1551 (for the reasons for this measure, see PIEPER, 153) ; the Abbate Riario took his place as Commissary General ; see Nuntiaturberichte, XII., n. 114. Letter of Medici at this time in CAMPORI, Lett. 19 *seqq.*

⁴ As this prohibition was in many cases not observed, Bernardo de' Medici was instructed to take steps against any disobedience. *Brief of June 12, 1551, *ibid.* n. 461 ; *cf. ibid.* n. 523 for a similar brief for Raynutio de Taranno, of June 24, 1551. (Secret Archives of the Vatican).

⁵ See RAYNALDUS, 1551, n. 15. Card. Alessandro was allowed, by a brief of July 1, 1551, to repair to Florence. (See Nuntiaturberichte, XII, n. 32. The original brief is in the State Archives Naples). From the brief of September 17, 1551, quoted here, it appears that Alessandro was by no means so quiet in Florence as

Orazio Farnese, who had hastened from France to support his brother, and had taken a prominent part in the invasion of the district of Bologna, was likewise severely punished; Julius III. caused the territory of Castro, which belonged to him, to be invested.¹ The mother of the Duke, who directed the government there, offered no resistance, whereupon the Pope was satisfied with the military occupation of the country; the administration, jurisdiction and revenues remained in the hands of the Duchess.²

An attempt was next made to maintain the fiction that the Peace of Crépy had not been broken by the outbreak of hostilities in Italy, and this was based on the assertion of Henry II. that he had only taken up arms as an ally of Farnese, while the Emperor declared he was only acting as a protector of the Church against a rebellious vassal, and at the express desire of the Pope. No one doubted, however, that war between the two princes was inevitable, and unfortunately the Turks at once endeavoured to gain an advantage from the strife between the two chief powers of Christendom. News of the threatening movements of the Turks reached Rome as early as June, and against these the Pope had now to take preventive measures.³ In July a large Turkish fleet

SEgni (XIII.) would have us believe. Cardinal Ranuccio Farnese was sharply enjoined by a *brief of September 17, 1551, (*ibid.*, n. 828), under threats of the most severe punishment, to return to Rome, but finally he was allowed to remain with his relatives in Urbino.

¹ Cf. *Briefs for Barthol. de Alba and Didaco de Mendoza of June 23, 1551, in Arm. 41, t. 60, n. 517, 520; *ibid.*, n. 561 the *penal Bull of July 1, against all who took part in the invasion of Bolognese territory (Secret Archives of the Vatican). Cf. also Nuntiaturberichte XII., n. 39.

² See the orders for Ascanio della Corgna of June 25, 1551, in Arm. 41, t. 60, *ibid.*, n. 532; cf. *ibid.*, n. 534 the *brief for Hier. Farnesiae of June 25, and n. 587 for Rod. Ballione of July 10, 1551 (Secret Archives of the Vatican).

³ A Commission of Cardinals was formed to arrange measures for the protection of the coasts of the States of the Church (see Serristori's *report of June 17, 1551. State Archives, Florence).

appeared in the Ionian Sea, which, however, had to give way before the resistance of the Knights of St. John from Malta, whereupon the Turks turned their attention to Tripoli, which fell into the hands of the infidels on August 14th.¹

The state of affairs in the field of war in Upper Italy had proved unfavourable to the Pope from the very beginning. The invasion of the territory of Bologna, where the enemy had caused great devastation, threatened to bring about an insurrection in the whole of the Romagna and to tear away Ravenna from the States of the Church.² To this danger to the temporal jurisdiction of the Pope was added a still graver threat to his ecclesiastical power; a schism of the French Church was by no means impossible, especially at that time, when there was so great a defection from Rome.³ The unsatisfactory financial position of Julius III. did not weigh less heavily in the scale, and already on June 22nd, the treasurer, Giovanni Ricci, had sent to the court of the Emperor to urge the payment of the pecuniary assistance promised. Charles V. declared he was prepared to pay 200,000 scudi down, if the Pope would grant him the revenues of the Spanish bishoprics to the amount of 500,000 scudi. Ricci could grant this, but received provisionally only 50,000 scudi.⁴

The Bishop of Nepi, P. A. de Angelis, was appointed commissary for this purpose by a *brief of July 4, 1551, Arm. 41, t. 61, n. 573; *ibid.*, n. 589, *Bull of July 11, 1551: Imposition of four-tenths in the Sienese district, so that Mendoza may protect the coast against the Turks, and n. 754, *Bull of September 2, 1551: Imposition of four-tenths in Savoy for the fortification of Nice (Secret Archives of the Vatican).

¹ Cf. RAYNALDUS, 1551, n. 68; ZINKEISEN, II., 875-6; ROMIER, 41-2.

² Cf. ADRIANI VIII., 3 and BROSCHE, I., 194. Count G. F. de Balneo received orders in a *brief of July 9, 1551, to assist the legate of the Romagna in the protection of the province. Brevia Arm. 41, t. 61, n. 585; cf. *ibid.*, n. 827 the *brief for Camillo Orsini of September 17, 1551 (Secret Archives of the Vatican).

³ See PIEPER, 25.

⁴ See Miscell. di stor. Ital., XVII., 337-8; Nuntiaturberichte, XII xlviii n. 37, 41; cf. PIEPER, I 44.

The Pope, who had allowed himself to be drawn into this war out of deference to the Emperor, was soon to discover that the conquest of Parma, as also of Mirandola, was not such an easy matter as had been represented to him. He had also to learn by experience that the expenses of the undertaking were to exceed the original estimate by more than double the amount. He sought in vain to improve the desperate financial straits in which he found himself by imposing special taxes, and was also forced to pledge many valuables and jewels. All this, however, was not sufficient to cover his requirements. Julius complained bitterly that the Emperor neither gave him the financial aid promised, nor did he send the number of troops arranged by treaty. Charles V. was, however, all the less able to fulfil his pledges as he was soon obliged to protect Milan against the French, who were threatening it from Piedmont.¹

The appearance of the French in Piedmont frightened the Pope and intimidated him. Cardinal Crescenzi, who was painfully conscious of the reaction of the war on the Council, again earnestly urged the Pope to make peace, while the fathers of the Council joined him in warnings to the same effect. On September 4th, 1551, the Pope addressed a long letter to the King of France, and frankly offered him his hand in peace.² Four days later followed the appointment of Cardinal Verallo as special legate to Henry II.³ Pietro Camaiani was sent to the Emperor on October 10th to explain the mission of Verallo, which the Pope had ordered as giving the highest proof of his love of peace, but at the same time to emphasize the fact that no agreement was to be thought of without the consent of the Emperor. Camaiani, however, did not obtain the success wished for, since the question of subsidies, "the great obstacle

¹ Cf. PALLAVICINI, 13, 1.

² *F. Borghese, II., 465, p. 174 (Secret Archives of the Vatican) in the translation of ROMIER, 44-5.

³ See Acta Consist. in PIEPER, 27; *ibid.* 145-6 emendation of the text of the instructions, dated October 3 in DRUFFEL, I, 757-8. Concerning Verallo's [unsuccessful] legation, a most detailed account in ROMIER, 47 *seqq.*, 53.

of the war from the beginning," was again not solved¹ to the satisfaction of the Pope, which was all the more painful to him as his financial position was daily becoming more hopeless ; He complained, indeed, that he had not only already pledged all his jewels, but even his usual rings.² In Rome everyone was at this time calling for peace.³ The Emperor himself was also in great want of money, as was Ferrante Gonzaga ; neither of them could any longer pay their mercenaries. The Pope, however, was undoubtedly in the worst position of all, for which reason he was also the first to grow weary of the war.⁴ In the middle of December he informed the Emperor, through Bertano, that he was no longer in a position to keep up the full number of his troops in Upper Italy.⁵

Meanwhile Cardinal Verallo had been negotiating with Henry II. The Pope on December 21st instructed Pietro Camaiani to inform Charles V. of the stage which these negotiations had reached. He by no means trusted the French King, and begged the Emperor also not to let himself be deceived, but to make all arrangements for continuing the war, as an imposing display of arms is more effective in securing peace than a victory in the field.⁶ Julius had been quite correct in his estimate of Henry II. Although the Pope was quite prepared to fulfil the conditions proposed by the King, Ottavio and France continued to make fresh difficulties ; they knew very well that two such strong places as Parma and Mirandola

¹ Concerning the dispatch of Camaiani, for which mission Card. Carpi had at first been chosen, *cf.* PIEPER, 28, 146-7 and Nuntiaturberichte XII. li, 88 *seqq.*

² DRUFFEL III., 240.

³ *Cf.* CUGNONI, prose ned. di A. Caro, 109.

⁴ Opinion of KUPKE in the Nuntiaturberichte, XII., li.

⁵ Nuntiaturberichte, XII., lv., 112 ; *cf.* GOSELLINI in the Miscell. di stor. Ital., XVII., 198.

⁶ See PIEPER, 150-1 ; PALLAVICINI, 13, 1, and Nuntiaturberichte, XII., 115, n. 1. *Cf.* also Serristori's reports of November 11 (Camaiani tarda a partir), December 4 (Camaiani kept back by the Pope, as news is expected from France), December 20, 1551 (Camaiani will start to-morrow). State Archives Florence.

would be very difficult to take by force, and trusting to this, they hoped to get still more favourable terms. For this purpose Cardinal Tournon, who was then in Venice, was sent to Rome.¹ He arrived there on February 5th, and at once began negotiations.²

Tournon, who had world-wide experience as a statesman, and was an accomplished courtier, conducted these with great shrewdness. He specially drew the Pope's attention to the fact that the Holy See could not reckon on the Emperor, on account of his bad health and the difficulties in which Germany was involved, representing to him, at the same time, the gravity of the position which was developing in the Council, as Charles V.'s sole idea was to increase his own authority at the expense of that of the Pope.³ In spite of the fact that the Emperor was imprudent enough to leave his Papal ally in doubt as to his own intentions,⁴ the French had the greatest difficulty in attaining their end, and after fully two months time they had not yet come to any arrangement. In the meantime the impossibility of continuing the war was daily becoming more apparent. In addition to the direst need of money,⁵ there was the fear that Henry II., who was allied

¹ The instruction of December 23, 1551, for Tournon, in RIBIER, II., 360 *seq.* According to PALLAVICINI, II., 2, it might be supposed that the asked for letter of safe-conduct had been refused; the *Salvus-Conductus* for him, dated December 24, 1551 is, however, in Min. brev. Arm. 41, t. 62, n. 1046 (Secret Archives of the Vatican).

² Concerning Tournon's journey and negotiations, see Legaz. di Serristori 296-7; DRUFFEL, II., 122-3, 176-7, 214, 265, 423; MASIIUS, Lettere, 97, 100-1; CHIESI, 228-9; Nuntiaturberichte, XII., lvii *seq.* 175-6, 198, 217 *seqq.*, 230-1, 241, 292 *seqq.*; *cf.* MAURENBRECHER, 281-2; DE LEVA, V., 312-3, 359-60.

³ See DESJARDINS, III., 297-8.

⁴ See Nuntiaturberichte., XII, lviii.

⁵ Julius III. had already tried to alleviate the financial difficulties on October 20, 1550, by the establishment of the Monte Giulio (*cf.* Acta Consist. in the Consistorial Archives, and Buonanni's *reports of October 21 and 25, 1550. State Archives, Florence. *Cf.*, also

to the Protestant princes of Germany, might fall away from the Church. In Rome itself consternation and excitement prevailed on all sides ; the city was defenceless and the rest of the States of the Church were not safe.¹

The conditions which Tournon at last laid down were as follows : Parma was to remain in the hands of Ottavio Farnese, an armistice with a suspension of all the censures issued was to be concluded for two years, and after this the Duke was to be at liberty to come to a final agreement with the Holy See, while his engagements to France would then cease ; the territory of Castro was to be returned to the Farnese Cardinals for their brother Orazio, but the Farnese family were to keep no larger number of troops there than was required to guard the territory. Finally, Henry II. was prepared to meet the Pope in ecclesiastical matters, and again to permit the bulls for the bestowal of benefices in France to be drawn up in the *Dataria* in Rome.

Charles V. naturally endeavoured to dissuade the Pope from the agreement suggested, and Giovan Battista del Monte also used all his influence to the same end.² All their representations, however, proved vain ; the misery of the position was so great that the Pope had finally to submit. On April 15th, 1552, he announced his resolve to the Cardinals in the con-

ENDEMANN, *Studien*, I)but in vain. G. Ricci, who was recalled from Spain to Rome in order to manage the finances, found them in the most dreadful state, and he was unable to be of any assistance. (See *MELE, *Genealogia d. famiglia Ricci*, 203. Ricci Archives, Rome) ; in a *letter to G. B. del Monte of April 2, 1552 (**Inf. polit.* XIX., 51. Royal Library, Berlin), Julius III. describes the financial distress which had never been greater for centuries. RANKE, I., 269 cites a passage from the letter, without giving its origin.

¹ Cf. del Monte's letter of April 13th, 1552, in *Nuntiaturberichte*, XII., 294-5. Julius III. also points out the fact that nothing was settled in his *letter to Card. Crescenzi of the same date, which is to be found in the *Inf. polit.* XIX., 59, 60, Royal Library, Berlin.

² See PALLAVICINI, 13, 2 ; cf. MAURENBRECHER, 287-8 ; *Nuntiaturberichte*, XII., lviii.

sistory in which the suspension of the Council was also discussed.¹ Everyone agreed without reserve. Cardinal Cervini was of opinion that if the Pope had had recourse to arms on righteous grounds, he now laid them down from still more righteous motives.² On April 29th the armistice was concluded on the said conditions, and it was left to the discretion of the Emperor to be a party to it as well.³ On the following day the Pope, in a detailed letter to Camaiani, explained to him the reasons which had induced him to come to terms with Cardinal Tournon. It had no longer been in his power to hesitate, as the population of Rome and the States of the Church would have been driven to despair; the impossibility of conquering Parma and Mirandola was obvious, for after a ten months' siege they had not yet succeeded in completely investing the latter fortress. He also pointed out that, in addition to this, there was the danger on the part of the Turks and the Lutherans, and the no less real danger of France falling into schism and becoming Lutheran.⁴ The Emperor did not conceal from Camaiani his displeasure at the one-sided proceeding of the Pope, but the outbreak of revolution in Germany forced him also to agree to the conditions of peace on May 10th, a step to which even Ferrante Gonzaga had urged him. The news reached Rome on May 15th and caused universal jubilation. Three days later the Abbot Rosetto was sent to

¹ See *Acta Consist, in the Consistorial Archives.

² Capilupi announces this on April 16, 1552; see Nuntiaturberichte, XII., lx., cf. 303.

³ The *capitoli dell' accordo di Parma*, dated April 29, 1552, were printed in the XVIth century in the Lett. di princ. III., 211-12. Kupke has taken no notice of this; he prints them once more from a copy with the erroneous date April 25 in the Nuntiaturberichte, XII., 365-6. Cf. COGGIOLA, Farnesi, 7 n. 2. In the *brief of May 18, Silvester de Giliis received orders to arrange for the honourable reception of Cardinal Tournon in the States of the Church, on his return from France (Min. brev. Arm. 41, t. 64, n. 330. Secret Archives of the Vatican).

⁴ See Nuntiaturberichte, XII., 324-5; cf. also the letter of G.B. del Monte in CHIESI, 226-7.

Lombardy to press forward the conclusion of the armistice.¹ The exile of Cardinal Alessandro Farnese also came to an end at the same time, and on June 7th, 1552, he returned to Rome, where the Pope received him very graciously. On June 25th, Lanssac appeared as special ambassador of France, and brought with him the ratification of the armistice by Henry II.² Soon afterwards the diplomatic representation of the Holy See at the French court was restored and Prospero Santa Croce was entrusted with the office. The new nuncio was able to report to Rome as early as September that Henry II., by his proceedings against Charles du Moulin, had renounced the anti-papal policy which he had shown in his edict of September, 1551.³

Notwithstanding the universal jubilation at the ending of the costly⁴ and dangerous war, the Pope must have been forced to acknowledge to himself that the two questions, for the solution of which he had worked so earnestly during the first two years of his pontificate, had both remained unsolved; that relating to ecclesiastical matters through the suspension of the Council, and the other through the result of the war. This depressing realization began to undermine his energy to a marked degree.⁵ It is false to say that "the Pope no longer took any active interest in political questions" and that he led "a harmless pleasant life" in his lovely villa outside the Porta del Popolo, "heedless of the rest of the world."⁶ Quite apart from the very important, though

¹ See *Nuntiaturberichte*, XII., lxi., 327, 334-5, 349-50, 354-5; *cf.* PIEPER, 32 and COGGIOLA, *Farnesi*, 9-10. R. Baglione received orders to evacuate Castro in the *brief of May 18, 1552 (*Min. brev. Arm.* 41, t. 64, n. 333. Secret Archives of the Vatican).

² See ROMIER in the *Mél. d'arch.* XXXI. (1911), 11-12.

³ *Cf.* PIEPER, 42-3, and ROMIER, *La crise gallicane*, 55.

⁴ The pay of the troops alone cost 300,000 scudi; *cf.* BALAN, *Mirandola*, 48.

⁵ See PIEPER, 40, 41.

⁶ So says RANKE, *Päpste*, I., 180-1; also BEAUFORT, *Hist. des Papes*, IV., 191 and all later historians, especially BROSCHE, I., 145, and last of all LANCIANI, III., 133. It is still more incorrect when

unobtrusive, activity which Julius III. displayed in ecclesiastical matters in the direction of a Catholic reformation, especially in the latter half of his reign,¹ he also set to work at vital political questions, and strove diligently, if ineffectually, for the restoration of peace in Christendom. His neutral attitude gave offence alike to the French and to the Imperialists, as both these parties expected to draw great advantage from a participation of the Pope in the struggle.² The accusation, therefore, that the Pope fled from all business in order to lead an inactive life in peace in his beautiful villa, originated with them.³ There can be no doubt that the Pope had very good reasons for not mixing himself any further in the Italian disturbances; the war about Parma had shown the results of such a course sufficiently plainly. Since the painful experience which Julius III. had then had, he had been very careful not to be again led into participating in such a struggle, while higher motives also weighed in the balance. The Pope knew that as Father of Christendom he must as far as possible

DE LEVA, V., 114 represents Julius III. as an "alieno dai negozi di stato" from the beginning. REUMONT, III., 2, 511 judged Julius III. much more justly in 1870. Concerning the by no means unobjectionable version of Muratori, see G. CATALINI, Preface to Muratori's *Annali* X. (1764), XXXV.

¹ Cf. Chapter VI. *infra*.

² Both sides addressed bitter reproaches to the neutral Pope; the same thing occurred in a congregation of Cardinals on September 4, 1553, when the Imperial Cardinals, Alvarez de Toledo and Carpi endeavoured to induce him to adopt an anti-French policy, by pointing out the alliance of Henry II. with the Turks (See Serristori's *report of September 5, 1553. State Archives, Florence). In the May of the following year Cardinal du Bellay and the French ambassador, Lanssac, made complaints. See Nonciat. de France, I., 51, n. 1.

³ See the Florentine reports cited in the Nonciat. de France, I., xliii., n. 2, an echo of which is found in ADRIANI (VIII., 1), who was commissioned by Cosimo I. to write (see MONDAINI, *Adriani*, 41-2, Florence, 1905), as well as in SEGNI (XIII., 829), and in Panvinio (MERKLE, II., 148) who was friendly with the Farnese family.

stand aside from party feeling, as then only could he be successful as a peacemaker.¹ How greatly the activity which he displayed in this direction proceeded from himself personally is proved by the fact that the greater part of the instructions for the ambassadors and legates were now drawn up by himself, and that he, for the most part, dictated personally to his secretaries.² In the midst of all this, his old enemy, the gout, was afflicting him to an increased extent.³

¹ See ANCEL in the *Nonciat. de France*, I., xliii. In the instructions for Gir. Muzzarelli of January 21, 1554, Julius III. speaks very openly about his having been led astray into making war over Parma; see PIEPER, 174.

² Cf. del Monte's letter of July 7, 1552, in PIEPER, 41, n. 3.

³ The reports of the ambassadors bear witness to the frequency of the painful attacks of the gout, to which were added catarrh and other disorders caused by errors of diet. Cf. especially the *letters of A. Serristori of June 7, 14 and 20, and of October 10, 11, and 24, 1552; also of January 4, March 29, June 9, July 6, and 9, 1553; *letters of the archbishop of Trani, Bart. Serristori, of October 19, 22, 23, and 24, and November 2, 1553; *letter of B. Justo of November 16, 1553; *letters of A. Serristori of February 7, 17, 18, 19, and March 3, 8, 14, 15, 27, 1554; *letters of B. Justo of February 24 and 26, 1554; *letters of A. Serristori of June 10 and July 21, 1554; *letter of B. Justo of September 15, 1554; all in State Archives, Florence. Concerning the physicians of Julius III. see, besides MARINI, I., 393 *seqq.*, HASER, II., 26; CARUS, *Gesch. der Zoologie*, 359; GRÄTZ, IX., 345, 350-1; RIEGER, II., 144-5; MASIUS, *Briefe*, 67; *Atti per le prov. di Romagna*, Ser. 3, I., 422. In the *Min. brev. Arm.* 41, t. 56, n. 456: *appointment of Aug. Ricchi of Lucca as physician in ordinary, with a yearly salary of 200 scudi, May 21, 1550; n. 513: *appointment of Theoder. de Sacerdotibus (Hebreus) as physician in ordinary, June 7, 1550; t. 59, n. 39: summons of Jo. de Aguilera, thesaur. Salamant. mag. in medic. to Rome, January 26, 1551 (Secret Archives of the Vatican). *Ibid.*, *Arm.* 44, t. 4, n. 25: summons of Franc. Fregimelia, doct. medic. to Rome, January 5, 1555. In the **Intr. et Exit.* of 1554-1555, payments to the three physicians of Julius II.: A. Ricchi, Giambatt. Cannani and Damiano Valentini are entered

The grave state of the Pope's health, which, in the November of 1553, made the possibility of a conclave in the near future apparent,¹ as well as the increasing hopelessness and confusion of the political position, had the effect of gradually depriving Julius of the fresh animating energy of the first years of his reign, and finally of paralysing his endeavours to make peace. Soon afterwards, however, zealous activity was displayed by the Pope in the direction of an attempt at mediation between the Emperor and France, although the prospects of success seemed most unfavourable.

Soon after the conclusion of the armistice, Julius III. addressed himself to Henry II., by a letter in his own hand, on May 6th, 1552, and begged him to make peace with Charles V.² The French King, however, had not the faintest idea of complying with this request, but hoped, on the contrary, that he could, just at that time, inflict a decisive blow on the Emperor by means of his conspiracy with the Turks.³ In spite of this, the Pope sent nuncios to bring about an armistice between the bitterly struggling rivals. As ordinary nuncio, Prospero Santa Croce went to Henry II., while Achille de' Grassi was sent to Charles V. The representations of both, however, fell on deaf ears.⁴ The fury of war raged worse than ever; in the middle of July, a Turkish fleet appeared before Naples, commanded by the corsair, Dragut, and the French envoy, Aramont; fortunately they could

(Cod. Vat. 10,605 of the Vatican Library). The Ravenna physician, Tommaso Rangoni, in 1550 dedicated to Julius III., his work, *De vita hominis ultra CXX. annos protrahenda*; see ILDEBRANDO DELLA GIOVANNA, *Come l'uomo può vivere più di CXX. anni*. Piacenza, 1897. (Nozze-Publication).

¹ See Nonciat. de France, I., 68.

² See the text in the *Inf. Polit., XIX., 79 (Royal Library, Berlin).

³ Cf. CHARRIÈRE, II., 201-2; ZINKEISEN, II., 876.

⁴ Concerning both missions cf. Pieper, 41-2, 156-7. Prospero Santa Croce was a close friend of Cardinal A. Farnese; his being chosen was, therefore, very significant; see Romier, in the *Mél. d'Arch.*, XXXI., 13.

do little damage, as the French fleet arrived too late.¹

Another undertaking of Henry II. had all the more brilliant a success. The inhabitants of Siena rose on July 27th, 1552, with the cry of "France, Victory, Freedom!" and forced the Spanish garrison to retire.² The new Republic at once placed itself under the protection of France. Nothing could have been more pleasing to Henry II. than this turn of affairs, as it not only threatened the position of the Emperor in Italy, but served the purpose of keeping the Pope, as well as Cosimo de' Medici, in check.³

The reaction of the troubles which had arisen in Tuscany was at once seen in Rome. In the middle of August, 1552, the wildest reports of an intended sack of the city by the Spaniards were in circulation, originated solely, as was supposed, for the purpose of putting the Pope into a false position with regard to the Emperor.⁴ As the disturbances in Siena were a grave danger to peace in the States of the Church, the Pope, whose treasury was completely exhausted by the war about Parma, found himself in a very critical position. Determined as he was to remain neutral in the impending struggle, his only thought was to prevent war, with its attendant horrors, from spreading over the States of the Church. He therefore ordered the enrolment of 4000 men.⁵ The anxiety and dismay increased in Rome when the end of the month

¹ Cf. CHARRIÈRE, II., 209 *seqq.*; Julius III. supported by his *brief of August 25, 1552, the preparations of Charles V. for war against the Turks (Min. brev. Arm. 41, t. 65, n. 565, Secret Archives of the Vatican).

² See REUMONT, *Toscana*, I., 181-2.

³ See REUMONT, III., 2, 508.

⁴ Cf. Serristori's *report of August 15, 1552 (State Archives, Florence). Camillo Orsini is also declared to be the originator of these rumours by Ipp. Capilupi, in his *report to Cardinal E. Gonzaga on August 18, 1552 (Gonzaga Archives, Mantua).

⁵ See Serristori's *report of August 21, 1552 (State Archives, Florence).

brought the worst news regarding the advance of the Turks in Hungary.¹

On August 13th, 1552, Julius III. had sent Cardinal Mignanelli to Siena to co-operate in the organization of the new constitution in such a manner as to preserve the peace and independence of the Republic, and assure it against the danger of interference by foreigners. Mignanelli, as a native of Siena, seemed more suited for this difficult task than anyone else could be, but in spite of all his good will, he could arrange nothing,² and, on September 28th, Julius III. had to recall him.³ It was quite clear what turn affairs were taking, when Cardinal d'Este, who was entirely devoted to French interests, arrived in Siena on November 1st, 1552, as governor for Henry II.⁴ A defensive and offensive alliance, and the transfer of additional French troops to Siena, showed how determined the French were to establish themselves firmly there.⁵ Pedro de Toledo, Viceroy of Naples, was preparing with all his might to drive them out, and thus, while the flames of war were hardly extinguished in Parma, another outbreak in Central Italy was threatened.

At the end of September, 1552, Julius III. had entrusted a commission consisting of four Cardinals with the task of deliberating upon measures for bringing about peace between Charles V. and the French king. He still hoped he would at least succeed in preventing this new disturbance of the peace of Italy, and repeatedly deliberated to this end with Cardinals

¹ See Serristori's *report of August 28, 1552 (State Archives, Florence). With regard to this matter, *cf.* HUBER, IV., 173-4.

² See Legaz. di Serristori, 311; ADRIANI, IX., 3; REUMONT, Toskana, I., 187.

³ *Min. brev. Arm. 41, t. 65, n. 636 (Secret Archives of the Vatican).

⁴ According to a coded *report of Ipp. Capilupi to Card. E. Gonzaga, of October 19, 1552, Dandino is supposed to have said that Card. Farnese had endeavoured to obtain the post which was given to Este (Gonzaga Archives, Mantua).

⁵ SOZZINI, 92-3.

de Cupis, Pacheco, Verallo, Puteo, Cicada and Mignanelli.¹ As he was well aware that the Viceroy of Naples was urging the Emperor to undertake an expedition against Siena, he sent Bernardo de' Medici to Pedro de Toledo at the end of November and advised him to wait a little longer before dispatching his troops. Pedro, however, persisted in his intention.²

In Rome, where the recollection of the dreadful sack of 1527 still lived in the memory of the people, new fears concerning the inimical intentions of the Spaniards again arose in December. The Pope, in consultation with the Cardinals, took precautionary measures, whereupon the Spanish party in Rome, as well as the Viceroy, made complaints. They should, however, have been pleased, as far as that was concerned, for the Pope, making the best of a bad bargain, allowed, in spite of his "neutrality," the Spanish troops to march through the States of the Church. The precautionary measures which he adopted served only to prevent deeds of violence and disturbances in his own territories.³ He sent Achille de'

¹ See Serristori's *reports of September 16 and 28, and October 3, 1552 (State Archives, Florence); RAYNALDUS, 1552, n. 44; DRUFFEL, II., 766-7, 778, 790-1. Cardinal Pacheco emphasizes the great desire of the Pope to mediate for peace, in a *letter to Card. Madruzzo, dated Rome, September 20, 1552 (Vice-regal Archives, Innsbruck).

² Regarding this dispatch, see PIEPER, 45.

³ Cf. besides Lasso's letter in DRUFFEL, II., 831, 840, the *Diario di Cola Coleine (*loc. cit.*, *supra*, Chigi Library, Rome); CARO, Lett. pubbl. da Mazzuchelli, II., 98; Serristori's *reports of December 17, 18, and 19, 1552; in that of the 19 he says: "Torno S.B^{ne} a alterarsi grandemente sopra l'haverle questa mattina in consistorio replicato il card. S. Jacomo et Burgos che la faceva male a armare dolendosi del modo che si era proceduto seco." (State Archives, Florence). The *brief for the episc. Nepes. [P. A. de Angelis] et abb. Breregno, regarding commissariatus ad hospitandum pedites et equites, quos vicerex Neapolis in Hetruriam mittit, is dated December 15, 1552 (Min. brev. Arm. 41, t. 66, n. 811. Secret Archives of the Vatican). Concerning the preparations for war at that time, see also Quellen und Forschungen des Preuss. Histor. Inst., VI., 101.

Grassi to Naples again at the last moment, at the end of December, once more to beg the Viceroy to come to a peaceful arrangement, but again in vain.¹

In the first days of the new year, 1553, Garcia de Toledo, the son of the Viceroy, started from Naples with the greater part of the Spanish army, and marched through the States of the Church to Cortona; his father proceeded with 30 galleys and 2500 Spaniards past Civitavecchia to Leghorn,² while Camillo Orsini had put Rome in a state of defence.³ The Pope, who, just at that moment, was lying ill with an attack of gout, endeavoured to protect his subjects from the very severe hardships which the passage of the Imperial troops had brought in its train.⁴ He commissioned Cardinal Alvarez de Toledo to persuade the leader of the Spanish army to agree to an armistice;⁵ this attempt, however, was unsuccessful, while the Emperor gave his approval to the arbitrary proceedings of his Viceroy. As the Venetian ambassador declares, Charles V. allowed Pedro de Toledo to do as he pleased, so as not to give rise to the idea that he was wanting in courage and military skill since his failure before Metz.⁶

¹ Cf. RAYNALDUS, 1553, n. 23, and PIEPER, 45.

² See ADRIANI, IX., 4; SOZZINI, 93; GALUZZI, 200-1; REUMONT Toskana, I. 189.

³ See Serristori's *reports of January 4 and 10, 1553 (State Archives, Florence); FIRMANUS, 499-500; cf. also the *reports of Cristof. Trissino to Card. Madruzzo, dated, Rome, January 8 and 15, 1553 (Vice-regal Archives, Innsbruck), and *Diario di Cola Coleine (*loc. cit.*, Chigi Library, Rome).

⁴ Cf. the *briefs to Orvieto of January 9, and to Card. Savelli, legate of the Marches, of January 13, 1553, in Min. brev. Arm. 41, t. 67, n. 15 and 27; *ibid.*, n. 30 to Abb. Brisegno: Charge of lodging Imperial army, January 14, 1553. Cf. n. 42, 43 to the episc. Nepes. and Card. S. Clementis of January 19. The Pope excused himself in a very friendly brief of January 10, 1553 (n. 18), for not having been able to greet him on his unexpected arrival in Civitavecchia (Secret Archives of the Vatican).

⁵ *Cardinal Burgensi, dated January 14, 1553, *loc. cit.* n. 31.

⁶ Venet. Dispatches, II., 593-4.

The benevolent neutrality which the Pope observed with regard to the Emperor afforded Charles the less satisfaction as, on the representation of the French ambassador, a captain of Henry II. was not prevented from marching through the Papal States with his mercenaries.¹ Those who knew the character of Julius III. thoroughly, believed that he would not take up a decisive position, until victory had unmistakably declared itself for one side or the other. The adherents of the Emperor thought it hard that there should be no qualified Spanish ambassador in Rome, who would have kept the very disunited Spanish Cardinals together.² To the joy of the French party a violent dispute arose between the Pope and Cardinal Juan Alvarez de Toledo in March, 1553. This quarrel, indeed, was settled, but had as a consequence the temporary withdrawal of the Cardinal from the Curia.³ The fortification of the city was, meanwhile, so far advanced that it seemed assured against any attack, and they hoped to render the Borgo quite impregnable in two months.⁴

At the beginning of February, 1553, it had transpired at the Curia that two envoys were about to be sent, who were to arrange for a peace between the Emperor and the French king. At first they contented themselves with the sending of couriers to the nuncios who were at the courts of the said

¹ See *briefs to Asc. della Corgna and Card. Fulvio della Corgna, of January 15, 1553. Min. brev., t. 67, n. 32-3. Secret Archives of the Vatican.

² See the coded **report of Serristori of February 1, 1553 (State Archives, Florence).

³ Cf. MASIVS for this, Lettere, 121; and Serristori's *reports of March 11, 13, and 21, 1553 (State Archives, Florence).

⁴ See Serristori's *letter of January 4, 1553. On January 11, he *writes: "Qui si attende a fortificar Borgo con far bastioni e fossi, dove ci sono a lavorare da 400 guastatori;" on March 14 he *says: "Ogni giorno il s. Camillo Orsini va crescendo il numero delli guastatori per la fortificatione di Borgo, il qual vuole che in duoi mesi sia inespugnabile." According to his *report of March 23, the number of "guastatori" amounted to 700. (State Archives, Florence).

Princes.¹ A month later Onofrio Camaiani was sent to Florence, and Federigo Fantuccio to Siena, for the purpose of arranging a peaceful issue of the troubles in the latter city.² In a consistory of April 3rd, 1553, the appointment of the two Cardinal-Legates took place, which had already been planned during the summer and autumn of the previous year.³ Dandino was to go to the Emperor and Capodiferro to Henry II., and they were instructed to declare, in the name of the Pope, that the latter only wished to fulfil his duty as Father of Christendom, and that he had no other interest in the establishment of peace than the well-being of all. For these reasons he offered himself as a mediator for the purpose of bringing about an agreement.⁴ Dandino left the Eternal City on April 14th, and Capodiferro two days later.⁵

In May the Pope made still further attempts, by means of repeated missions to Siena, to bring the "miserable and barbaric war" which raged there between the Imperialists and

¹ *Serristori on February 1 and 6, 1553 (State Archives, Florence).

² Concerning both dispatches see PIEPER, 46. The *Memoriale for Camaiani in Cod. Ottob., 1888, p. 1-2 of the Vatican Library. The departure of Camaiani took place on March 2 (see Serristori's *letter of that date. State Archives, Florence). The *briefs to Siena, Termes, and Card. Este with regard to Fantuccio, are of March 28, 1553. Min. brev., t. 67, n. 231-233 (Secret Archives of the Vatican).

³ See RAYNALDUS, 1552, n. 44; cf. PIEPER, 50.

⁴ Concerning the dispatch of the two legates, see, besides Serristori's *reports of March 29 and April 3, 6 and 8, 1553 (State Archives, Florence), and Capilupi's *letter of April 3, 1553 (Gonzaga Archives, Mantua), RAYNALDUS, 1553, n. 18 *seqq.*; FIRMANUS 500 and especially PIEPER, 50-1, 161-2, 166 *seqq.* A rare impression of the Bulla facultatum H. card. Imolensis (dated 1553, April 3) Lovanii, 1553, is in the British Museum.

⁵ See FIRMANUS, 500 and *letter of Serristori of April 14, 1553 (State Archives, Florence). Cf. Nonciat. de France, I., 28, and KUPKE in Quellen und Forschungen des Preuss. Histor. Inst., IV., 82 *seqq.*

the French to an end.¹ At the beginning of June, Julius III., who at that time appointed the Duke of Urbino as Captain-General of the Church,² went to Viterbo, in order to discuss matters with the Sieneſe representatives there.³ The hopes which were entertained of the ſucceſs of this ſtep⁴ were not realized, as Cardinal d'Este was opposed to it. He had already received news that a turn in the poſition of affairs was imminent,⁵ which ſoon, indeed, proved to be the caſe. The threatening of Naples by a Turkiſh fleet forced the Imperialiſts to ſtrengthen the gariſon there, and they were conſequently obliged to raiſe the ſiege of Siena on June 15th.⁶ The Sieneſe queſtion, however, which had aſſumed ſuch unexpected importance, had by no means thereby found a ſolution.

In the meantime the two peace legates had reached the end of their journey, but they did not manage to come to any arrangement.⁷ It ſeemed, indeed, at that time, as if the

¹ Concerning the diſpatch of G. A. Vimercato and Card. N. Gaetani ſee SOZZINI, 131, 135, 137-8, and PIEPER, 47-8. Numerous *briefs concerning the diſpatch of G. A. Vimercato in Min. brev. Arm. 41, t. 68, n. 326, 340-1 (Secret Archives of the Vatican).

² See FIRMANUS, 501.

³ Cf. beſides SOZZINI, 139-140, ADRIANI, IX., 4, and Carte Strozzi, I., 500, the *report of Serristori dated Rome, 1553, June 2 (the Pope goes to Viterbo to-day ; *va con ſperanza grande di concludere l'accordo perchè l'ambasciatore Franzese gle lo prometto certo ; oltre che per una lettera che ſcrive un agente del card. di Ferrara da S. Germano al legato S. Giorgio ſi vede che il re lo deſidera*), and the *letters from Viterbo of June 6 (conference with the Cardinals), 9 (the Pope's attack of gout), and 17 (tomorrow we return to Rome). State Archives,

⁴ See Serristori's *report of July 3, 1553, concerning the conſiſtory on this date (State Archives, Florence).

⁵ See PIEPER, 49.

⁶ SOZZINI, 143-4. The Pope allowed the march of the Imperial troops through the States of the Church. Min. brev., t. 67, n. 406, 415, 427 (Secret Archives of the Vatican).

⁷ Cf. GACHARD, Archives du Vatican, 52-3, and Biogr. Nat., III., 864-5. MASIVS, Lettere, 122-3 ; Venet. Diſpatches, II., 603-4 ; PIEPER, 52-3.

exasperation and eager desire for war which filled the hearts of Charles V. and Henry II. with hatred against each other, had assumed a more intense character than before. The news from the legates sounded so hopeless that the general congregation of Cardinals proposed their recall. On July 31st, by command of the Pope, the affair was once more discussed by a special commission of six Cardinals: Carpi, Puteo, Pighino, Alvarez de Toledo, Sermoneta and de Cupis. De Cupis, on this occasion, spoke strongly in favour of recalling them, but Carpi opposed him, pointing out the Emperor's increasing success in the war, which would force Henry II. to come to terms. Most of the Cardinals approved of this view,¹ and on August 1st, the Pope decided in this sense, the peace mission of the legates being extended for two months longer.²

It was only with great difficulty that Dandino succeeded in inducing the Emperor to formulate his conditions of peace with greater exactitude; these, however, went so far that Henry II. utterly refused an answer. Thereupon the legates started on their return journey to Rome at the beginning of October.³

They travelled slowly; on again reaching the Eternal City on December 3rd,⁴ Dandino could see the harmful effects consequent upon the Sienese war. In the very populous Florentine colony which had long existed in Rome there were many exiles and other opponents of the Medici. The hopes of these people, who clung with the greatest tenacity to their old ideals, were strengthened when Piero Strozzi,⁵ who had been appointed French commandant in Siena, instead of Termes, reached Rome at the end of the year, where

¹ See Serristori's detailed **report of July 31, 1553 (State Archives, Florence). Cf. TURNBULL, *Queen Mary*, n. 4.

² "Ha giudicato S.S.¹à doppo d'haver udito i pareri et voti delle due congregationi generale et particolare esser meglio che i legati restino che richiamarli." *Serristori on August 1, 1553 (State Archives, Florence). Cf. PIEPER, 54.

³ See PIEPER, 54-5.

⁴ See FIRMANUS, 501.

⁵ Cf. COPPINI, P. Strozzi nell' assedio di Siena, Florence, 1902.

he discussed with the Pope the prolongation of the armistice in connection with the affair of Parma.¹

The year 1554 brought with it the decision as to the fate of Siena. The shrewdest of all the politicians in the Italy of those days, Cosimo de' Medici, who had been reconciled to the Emperor by a secret treaty of November 25th, 1551, overcame the neighbouring Republic by means of a base act of violence. On January 26th, 1554, his troops took forcible possession of the fortress of Camullia, situated immediately in front of the gates of Siena. His undertaking, as he declared to the Sieneſe, had no other object than to restore to them their freedom and independence, of which the French had robbed them. The Republic was not deceived by such hypocritical good-will. With fierce determination the Sieneſe prepared to defend their independence, and thereupon an inhuman war at once broke out, which was waged on both sides with almost unexampled stubbornness and barbarity.²

When, in May 1554, a new nuncio, in the person of Sebastiano Gualterio, was sent to France in the place of Prospero Santa Croce, he received, in addition to his principal mission of urging Henry II. to make peace with the Emperor, special directions to offer the Pope as mediator in the Sieneſe struggle. In the instructions, the very great injury which the Sieneſe war was causing to the States of the Church is emphasized. The Pope had been obliged to pay 150,000 scudi for putting Rome and the other possessions of the Holy See in a state of defence ; the salary of the Duke of Urbino as Captain-General of the Church necessitated an annual outly of 30,000 scudi ; moreover, the dislocation of traffic and commerce by land

¹ The prolongation of the armistice (see *Barb., 2,392, p. 166-7. Vatican Library) was signed by Card. du Bellay and Lanssac on February 3, 1554, ratified by Henry II. on March 3, and delivered to the Pope on April 26 (see SAUZÉ, 374-5 and COGGIOLA, Farnesi, 14-5) ; Julius III. communicated it to Ottavio by a *brief of April 27, 1554 (Min. brev. Arm. 41, t. 70, n. 233. Secret Archives of the Vatican). On April 29, the *Breve assolutorio* for Ottavio Farnese was issued ; see COGGIOLA, 15-6, 254-5.

² See REUMONT, Toscana, I., 199 *seqq.*

and sea had also to be taken into consideration. In these instructions stress is also laid on the neutrality of the Pope, who had allowed the partisans of France to draw military stores from the States of the Church and enrol troops there.¹ That was to the point,² but on the other hand it could not be denied that on the whole the Papal "neutrality" had a more or less Imperialist tendency. This was the result, not only of the old weakness of the Pope for Charles V., but was much more due to the very friendly relations that had all along existed between him and Cosimo I.³ These had, however, been very much disturbed in July, 1554, when Julius III. had been weak enough to allow the French auxiliary troops, destined for Siena, to march through the States of the Church. Besides this there were also serious differences with the Florentine ambassador, Averardo Serristori.⁴ The former friendly relations were, however, at once restored when the Pope's brother, Baldovino, congratulated the Duke on the brilliant victory which his troops had gained over Piero Strozzi at Marciano on August 2nd, 1554.⁵

Julius III. again made several vain attempts, from October, 1554, to the end of January in the following year, to bring

¹ See *Nonciat. de France*, I., 22 *seqq.*

² Concerning the incredibly weak behaviour of Julius III., and his curious neutrality, see REUMONT, III., 2, 509.

³ With his *brief of December 27, 1551, Julius had sent the Duke a blessed Cap and Sword. *Min. brev. t.* 62, n. 1054. *Ibid.*, t. 66, n. 763 a *brief characteristic of their intimate relations, to Cosimo I., on November 29, 1552 (*Secret Archives of the Vatican*).

⁴ Cf. concerning this DESJARDINS, III., 343-4; GORI, *Arch.*, I., 28; *Riv. Europ.* VI. (1878), 629 *seqq.*; *Stor. Ital. Ser.* 4, II., 12-3; *Nonciat. de France*, I., n. 55, 81. That Julius III. had previously suggested the recall of Serristori is evident from the **brief to Cosimo I. of June 10, 1554, unknown until now, (*Min. brev. Arm.* 41, t. 71, n. 342. *Secret Archives of the Vatican*).

⁵ See *Nonciat. de France*, I., 84 n. 2. Baldovino and the Governor of Rome illuminated their palaces at the celebration of the victory; see **Diario di Cola Coleine*, Chigi Library, *loc. cit.*

the vexed Sienese question to a peaceful solution.¹ He did not survive till the fall of the Republic ; his old trouble, the gout, and an unwise starvation cure brought his life to an end on March 23rd, 1555.²

¹ See Nonciat. de France, I. xlix *seqq.* A. Agostini, who was sent to the Emperor in January, 1555, was to impress on him the necessity for a peace with France (see PIEPER, 68). Cf. also PALANDRI, n. 83, concerning the complaints of Julius III. with regard to the conduct of Cosimo I.

² The state of health of Julius III. was so grave that Serristori was of opinion, as early as the Autumn of 1554, that a slight attack would bring about his death (*Report of September 29, 1554. State Archives, Florence). On February 12, 1555, the Pope was again attacked by gout, and had to take to his bed (See MASSARELLI, 247). His strength gradually decreased, as the doctors ordered a very low diet, a drastic measure which his stomach, accustomed to rich food, could not withstand (see Panvinio in MERKLE, II., 248, n. 1). The Bishop of Pavia *writes on March 18: "S.Stà già sono 32 giorni che sta in letto senza pericolo, ma debole et senza appetito et come esso dice in termine, se gli sopraggiungesse alcuno accidente che forse la fariano male" (State Archives, Florence) ; however, it was still hoped on March 9, that he would soon recover (*N.S. tuttavia continua nella sua indispositione, ma non pero più grave sperandosi che presto sia per convalersi. G. Maggio on March 9, State Archives, Bologna) ; and on the 16, Serristori *writes : "N.S. se bene è assai battuto sta pero assai quieto in modo che presto si dovera levar da letto." On March 19 the Pope's state was grave, and on the 21, hopeless. See concerning this, besides MASSARELLI, 247, the *letters of Fulgenzio Gianettini of March 21 and 22 (State Archives, Bologna) and the *reports of Serristori of March 19, 21 and 22 (State Archives, Florence) ; the passage from the letter of the 22, relating the disappointment of the relatives whose requests the dying Pope did not grant, is printed in the Nonciat. de France, I., xlv., n. 4. On March 22, "a hore 20." F. Gianettini announces : "La notte passata, alle 7 hore S.Stà udì messa et confessò et reconciliato pigliò il s^{to} sacramento della communione et li a poco chiedi l'estrema untione, which he received. To-day all the Cardinals went to the Pope, whom no one could any longer understand." State Archives, Bologna ; *Ibid.* the announcement of the death,

In the crypt of St. Peter's, the simple sarcophagus, distinguished only by the words "Pope Julius III.," which contains his remains, can still be seen.¹ It is not by chance that this Pope has no special tomb, for his reign has left no deep traces. He did not realize the expectations to which his activities as Cardinal, and the zeal he displayed at the beginning of his pontificate, gave rise.

He had nothing in common with the great Pope after whom Giovan Maria del Monte was called, but the name. And this is not only true in the sense of his not being the patron of art and letters, but in other respects as well, as the very qualities which specially distinguished Julius II., independence of character, energy and power, were totally wanting in him. He was of a sanguine temperament, with rapidly changing moods, easily influenced and exceedingly nervous and timid, and was constantly in a state of vacillation and indecision. The times, full of the harshest contrasts, called for a strong unbending character; such a man as Julius III. was quite incapable of dealing with the particularly difficult conditions. Paul IV. afterwards described his compliance and dependence on the Imperialists in the sharpest terms; he said that Julius III. had no longer been master in Rome, and had been obliged to do what the Spaniards wanted.² It is at all events certain that Julius made a fatal mistake when he allowed himself to be led into making war on Ottavio Farnese, the consequences of which caused great financial and moral injury to the Holy See.³

written immediately afterwards, "a hore 19." Cf. also Acta consist. in GULIK-EUBEL, 34; J. V. MEGGEN in the Archiv. für schweiz. Reform-Gesch., III., 514; the Portuguese reports in Corpo Dipl. Port., VII., 375-6.

¹ See DIONYSIUS, Crypt. Vatic. tab., LV.; TURRIGIO, 387; FORCELLA, VI., 70; DUFRESNE, 91.

² See *report of Navagero, dat. Rome, July 25, 1556 (St. Mark's Library, Venice).

³ See *supra* p. 140. In consequence of his friendly attitude to the Emperor, satires on the dead Pope continued to be published, especially in France. Cf. FAVRE, Olivier de Magny, 59 *seqq.* Concerning the scarcity of money at the death of Julius III., cf. Mitteil. des Ostr. Inst., XIV., 544.

It is also undeniable that the Pope by no means drew the correct inferences from the exceedingly grave position in which the Church was placed by the serious defection in the north ; he never sufficiently realized how greatly the times had changed. The Church, already bleeding from a thousand wounds, was daily receiving new blows from incensed enemies and undutiful children. Julius III. gave the painful impression that, instead of retiring within himself in prayer and contemplation, he gave himself up in a more ingenuous manner, like the great nobles of the Renaissance period, to the amusements of comedies, court jesters and card-playing. The " *Hilaritas publica* " which one of his medals extols,¹ was not in place at a time when the faithful Catholic chronicler, Johann Oldecop, had this inscription placed on his house in Hildesheim : " Duty has ceased, the Church is convulsed, the clergy has gone astray, the devil rules, simony prevails, the Word of God remains for all eternity."²

One must not, however, go too far in accusing Julius III. He has been unjustly made responsible for the interruption of the Council, and the unfortunate sudden change of affairs in Germany ; he is also not to blame for the short duration of the reconciliation of England with the Church. It was, however, unavoidable that a deep shadow should have been thrown over his pontificate by all these events, and that this should dim his very remarkable activity within the Church, and especially his efforts for reform. Because this activity was not sufficiently known, and was therefore underestimated, the dark side of his pontificate is more evident to us, while the, at any rate weaker, bright side has fallen too much into the background.³

¹ See VENUTI, 91.

² Cf. JANSEN-PASTOR, VIII., 427.

³ All that Julius III. had done for Rome and the States of the Church was almost entirely forgotten. In this respect his care for strict justice is especially worthy of remark. Cf. thereupon Buonanni's *report of September 20, 1550, and Serristori's of September 16, 1552 (State Archives, Florence) ; see also the " Bulla deput. card. Tranen. et de Puteo ac S. Calixti et S. Clem-

tis ad superintendendum rebus urbis et audiendum quaerelas," dat. 1553 VI. Id. Oct.; printed copy in the Colonna Archives, Rome; *Ibid.* the *brief of May 29, 1554, against the "banditi dello stato Romano." See also in Appendix No. 15, the *brief of May 6, 1552, concerning the work of making the Upper Tiber navigable. On March 3, 1551, Julius III. appointed Paulus de Tarano as commissary "super dessicatione paludum" of the States of the Church to the borders of Siena and Florence. Arm. 41, t. 59, n. 219; *ibid.* t. 64, n. 388, the *brief for Bernardus Machiavellus Florent. of June 22, 1552, concerning the continuation and rendering safe of the drainage of the marshes at Foligno, Trevi and Montefiascone, begun by Paul III. (Secret Archives of the Vatican). Concerning his care for the defence of Rome and Civitavecchia, *cf. infra* Chapter XIV. To the brighter side of the character of Julius III., which is overlooked, belongs also his great benevolence. His almoner, the worthy Francesco Vanuzzi (*cf.* FORCELLA, XII., 514), paid 245 scudi monthly to the poor. The "Ospedale degli Incurabili" and the institution "delle orfanelle" each received 100 scudi a month; besides this, convents and other needy establishments were generously and regularly aided. See *Intr. et Exit., 1554-1555, Cod. Vat. 10605 of the Vatican Library.

CHAPTER VI.

EFFORTS OF JULIUS III. FOR REFORM—CREATION OF CARDINALS.

AT the very beginning of his reign, in March, 1550, Julius III. had taken in hand the carrying on of the reform work begun by his predecessor, and, in order to deliberate on this most important matter, in which the reform of the abuses in the Dataria was especially to be considered, he appointed a commission, consisting of Cardinals de Cupis, Carafa, Sfondrato, Crescenzi, Pole and Cibo.¹ Cibo soon fell dangerously ill, and died on April 14th.² As other members of the commission also fell ill or had to be absent from Rome, the matter came temporarily to a standstill, but the Pope re-opened it by urging, in a consistory of July 21st, 1550, the energetic resumption of the work, in view of the near approach of the Council. He submitted the question to the Cardinals, whether it would be better to form a new commission, to wait for the arrival of the absent members, or to summon them. The College of Cardinals decided on the latter course, and resolved that new members should be appointed in the place of those who were prevented from returning.³ As gross abuses had become apparent during the last conclave, the Pope at the same consistory of July 21st⁴ commissioned Cardinals Medici and

¹ Cf. *supra* p. 57 and Appendix Nos. 7 and 8.

² See the *reports of Buonanni of April 9 and 14, and that of *Serristori of April 13, 1550 (State Archives, Florence).

³ See *Acta consist. cancell., VI., 54; and SCHWEITZER, Reformen unter Julius III., 53-4. As Schweitzer is preparing a special publication, I have purposely refrained from entering into many particulars.

⁴ Cf. SÄGMÜLLER, Papstwahlbullen, 18-19; SCHWEITZER, 54.

Maffei to consider proposals for reform. By the beginning of August, as we are informed by a Florentine correspondent,¹ Julius III. had reformed his own entourage, and had also spoken of a reform of the College of Cardinals.²

How zealously the Pope intended to carry out his campaign of reform, even before the meeting of the Council, is shown by the fact that on September 7th, 1550, he commissioned the former secretary of the Council, Massarelli, to prepare a summary of such reform proposals as had not yet been deliberated on at Trent. These were now to be finally dealt with in Rome, for which purpose three of the most experienced members of the Sacred College, Cervini, Pole and Morone, were summoned to return to the Curia at the end of September.³ On October 3rd, the Pope was in a position to announce that the labours of Cardinals Medici and Maffei were proceeding most favourably, and that they had already drawn up a Bull for the reform of the conclave. De Cupis was to communicate this document to the different Cardinals, so that they might say whether they had anything to add or to delete.⁴ The Florentine ambassador sent a copy to Cosimo I. on October 13th, telling him to keep it secret, and above all, to take care that the officious humanist, Giovio, did not get a glimpse of it and prematurely make it public.⁵

¹ "Ha fatto la reforma della casa sua." *Buonanni on August 6, 1550. Concerning the Conclave reforms, the latter thinks: "L'opera è santissima, ma chi la farà metter in esecuzione?" (State Archives, Florence).

² See in Appendix No. 9., Buonanni's *letter of August 2, 1550 (State Archives, Florence).

³ See MASSARELLI, 190, 193.

⁴ See Acta consist. in LAEMMER, Melet., 206; cf. GULIK, 34 and SÄGMÜLLER, Papstwahlbulen, 20.

⁵ "Aspettonsi i rev^{mi} S. Croce et Inghilterra perchè possa essere vista da loro et poi dagl' altri cardinali la minuta della bolla del conclave, che sarà presto espedita a fine che di poi possa mandarsi a S.M.^{tà} sopra l'indicatione di detto concilio di Trento Con questa sarà la copia della riforma che S.S.^{tà} vorrebbe dare ai

When, at the end of October, Cardinals Cervini, Morone and Pole had arrived in Rome, decisive steps with regard to the question of reform were expected in the immediate future.¹ In November and December the most exhaustive deliberations were repeatedly held in the consistory and elsewhere concerning this important question.² Even the sceptical Florentine, Buonanni, no longer doubted as to the sincerity of the members of the commission.³

A compilation of the dispensations which hitherto had been granted by the Dataria, and which had given rise to much scandal, of itself shows the difficulties which had to be overcome.⁴ Seventeen of these, which were to be duly discussed and examined, were specially called in question. Cardinals de Cupis, Carafa, Cervini, Crescenzi, Pisani and Pole were entrusted with this work in December. The Pope, says the Florentine ambassador, Serristori, by his reform of the Dataria, wishes to show that in his efforts for reform, he is beginning at home.⁵ The same object was served by the continued

conclavi a venire, la quale prega i rev^{mo} de Medici che non sia pubblicata et soprattutto non vada in man del Jovio, poichè S.St^a come pare giusto vuole prima ch'ella sia vista dal collegio et ritoccata dove paresse bene et poi pubblicata, passata ch'ella fusse per consistorio." *Buonanni, Rome, October 13, 1550 (State Archives, Florence).

¹ " Poiche si trovano qui i rev^{mi} S. Croce, Morone et Inghilterra si metterà mano alle cose della riforma, la quelle dicono che sarà fuori inanzi del Natale." *Buonanni, Rome, October 25, 1550 (State Archives, Florence). See also Buonanni's *report of October 30, and the letter of Masius in LACOMBLET, Archiv, VI., 165.

² Cf. MASSARELLI, 198, 199, 202, 204.

³ " Di qua s'attenderà al presente alla reforma, la quale si trova in man d'alcuni reverendissimi, che la faran più stretta che potranno per quanto starà in loro." *Buonanni on November 14, 1550 (State Archives, Florence).

⁴ See SCHWEITZER, 55.

⁵ Serristori announces the *installation of the commission " in ultimo concistorio, acciò che nella riforma si cominciassse prima di quel tocasse all'utile di S.St^a " on December 20, 1550 (State Archives, Florence).

retrenchment in the expenses of the court, already begun in February.¹ On February 27th, 1551, the work on the reform of the Dataria had already progressed so far that the Pope could indicate to the delegated Cardinals the principles according to which the decrees to be promulgated were to be drawn up.² Julius III. had already, on February 12th and 16th, gone minutely into the question of a reform of the system of preaching and confession, with Cardinal Crescenzi, the Bulls in connection therewith being laid before the Inquisition. At the same time a reform of the Penitentiary was being planned.³ Julius III., in a secret consistory of February 18th, ordered that a further commission of eleven Cardinals should assemble twice a week in the apartments of the Dean of the Sacred College, and that a report as to the progress of their work should be submitted to him every Saturday.⁴ It appears from a note in the Pope's own hand, that he was also employed upon a reform of the *Signatura gratiæ*, by which the dispensations were very substantially limited.⁵ On February 23rd the Pope again discussed the question of reform for the whole day with Cardinal Crescenzi, and for this purpose had the old Bulls in the archives of the Castle of St. Angelo examined,⁶

¹ See Matteo Dandolo's *report of February 12, 1550, in State Archives, Venice (*cf.* DE LEVA, V., 139) and the *letter of Buonanni of December 1, 1550, in which he says: "S.S.^{tà} o per meglio dir il suo maiordomo ha fatta una reforma bestialissima di persone e di bestie che mangiavano in casa, et dicono che fra tutte sono state 300, per le quali prova il detto maiordomo che si avvanzeranno l'anno 30,000 scudi." (State Archives, Florence). Concerning the Ruoli della famiglia di Giulio III., see MORONI, XXIII., 63-4.

² See MASSARELLI, 217, and SCHWEITZER, 55.

³ "Iam tempus est, ut ad Nos et ad tua penitentiariae, de cuius reformatione agendum est, officia redeas." *Brief to Card. Ranuccio Farnese of February 27, 1551 (Arm. 41, t. 59, n. 97. Secret Archives of the Vatican).

⁴ See *Acta consist. cancell. VI., 72a (Consistorial Archives), and MASSARELLI, 216.

⁵ See SCHWEITZER, 55.

⁶ See MASSARELLI, 216.

and at least part of the reform work prepared which was to be made ready before the opening of the Council.¹ Then the political troubles which arose through the question of Parma came to prevent progress in the matter. However much these may have interfered with the peaceful continuation of the work, the opinion of an expert of the time is justified, who says that an important beginning had already been made in this direction before the opening of the Council. There can be no doubt that Julius III. was not afraid to take the work in hand with determined energy, and with clear insight to fix on precisely those institutions which were chiefly in need of reform: the Dataria, the *Signatura gratiæ* and the conclave. The immediate result of his endeavours was, certainly, not great, but that was not the fault of the Pope, since he did not fail in admonitions; but it was, above all, a consequence of "the difficult times and of the immense amount of work called for by the re-opening of the Council."²

How very sincerely the Pope was animated by this wish to abolish abuses in the Church, wherever he found them, is also shown by his various reform statutes. It appears from these still unpublished documents, that his care was extended to the secular as well as the regular clergy. The statutes, which were issued immediately after his election, were concerned chiefly with Italy, but there were also others for Germany, Spain and Portugal.³

The reform decrees, published by the Council in its 13th and 14th Sessions, were to secure the official jurisdiction of the bishops and to render possible the punishment of bad ecclesiastics. In the further deliberations of the Council, the old dispute regarding the authority of the Pope over the Council,

¹ "Attendesi alle cose della reforma, parte delle quali si pubblicherà di qua et parte si manderanno alla resolution del concilio."

*Buonanni, February 26, 1551 (State Archives, Florence).

² Opinion of SCHWEITZER, 56; cf. SÄGMÜLLER, *Papstwahl-bullen*, 22-3.

³ For France only one document. See summary of *Briefs which are in the Secret Archives of the Vatican, in Appendix No. 28.

which had been so fateful to the synods of the XVth century, again showed itself. Julius III. declared with outspoken candour, in view of the dangerous advance of the Spanish pretensions, that, although it was his greatest wish to proceed energetically with the work of reform, the authority with which God had invested him must, at the same time, not be impugned.¹ Events would prove, after the conclusion of the Council, and the end of the war concerning Parma, whether he was really determined to carry out his work of reform. The plan of continuing this in Rome, with the help of the members of the suspended Council, was not approved of by them,² and he was therefore obliged to take up the laborious task alone.

How earnestly the Pope felt about this matter is shown by the fact that during the whole of May, 1552, his mind was occupied with the idea of degrading the unworthy Cardinal del Monte, whose elevation had so severely compromised him, and of setting him back into the lay state.³ Unfortunately, the idea came to nothing, but, on the other hand, the work concerning the reform of the conclave was again taken up. The draft of a Bull drawn up by Maffei and Medici concerning this matter was placed in the hands of Cervini for final revision. The latter handed the Pope his work at the end of July, and the decisive steps were to be taken after the summer vacation.⁴ During the vacation, Julius III., in a consistory of August 24th, published a salutary restriction of the giving of benefices, which were frequently asked for on the most frivolous grounds. Henceforth only the canonical grounds were to be regarded as valid, and the association of any definite condition, in connection with the grant, was also forbidden.⁵

¹ See *supra* p. 124.

² See *supra* pp. 127 *seq.*

³ "Il card. di Carpi mi ha detto sapere di buon luogo che S.^{ta} ha in animo di far tornare al seculo il card. de Monte et darli per moglie la sig^{ra} Ersilia." Coded *report of Serristori of May 10, 1552 (State Archives, Florence).

⁴ See Cervini's letter in DRUFFEL, II., 669; cf. SÄGMÜLLER, Papstwahlbulen, 26.

⁵ See Acta consist. in SCHWEITZER, 56.

A consistory of September 16th, 1552, in which the Pope produced a comprehensive plan for carrying out the work of reform, caused a great sensation. This was to begin with the new regulations about the conclave, so that the candidate whom God desired should be chosen, and the election not be hampered by human cunning and trickery. The one chosen, continued the Pope, should be admonished to observe the commandments of God and the Church with fidelity. It was to be impressed on the Cardinals that their most sacred duty was to assist the Pope with such counsel as they considered wholesome and salutary; they were not to possess more than one bishopric, which they were to visit in accordance with their duty, and they were forbidden to hold pastoral offices *in commendam*. Julius III. recommended to the bishops a strict observance of their duty of residence, from which only those were to be exempt who had to hold a fixed office in Rome or elsewhere. The bishops were to invest with benefices only such priests as were worthy, and no one was to receive Holy Orders in Rome or elsewhere without the permission of his ordinary. After the confirmation of these regulations, the reform of the Dataria, of the Penitentiary, and lastly, of worldly princes, was to be carried out.¹

The Pope had spoken so earnestly that even the Spaniards, such as Pacheco, believed in the sincerity of his intentions.² The representative of King Ferdinand I., Diego Lasso, was of opinion that even the Council could undertake no greater reform.³

At the end of October, 1552, the Cardinals of the reform commission began their deliberations under the presidency of Cervini, who had been summoned to Rome; two protocols

¹ SCHWEITZER was the first to draw attention (p. 57) to the speech of Julius III. preserved by Massarelli. Serristori refers in his *report of September 16, 1552 (State Archives, Florence), to the consistory, but just as briefly as do the Acta consistorialia of the Consistorial Archives.

² See the *letter of Card. Pacheco to Card. Madruzzo, dat. Rome, September 20, 1552 (Vice-regal Archives, Innsbruck).

³ See DRUFFEL, II., 767.

inform us of the progress they made. One, that of Cardinal Maffei, includes the months of October and November, while the other, drawn up by the president, begins with the November of 1552, and continues until the April of the following year.¹

At the first sitting, which took place on October 26th, 1552, Cardinals Pacheco, Puteo, Pighino, Cicada and Maffei assisted, as well as the president. From other reports it appears that Cardinals Verallo and Carafa were also present at the sittings of the commission from time to time.² They all worked in accordance with the programme laid down by Julius III., and, in addition to the reform of the conclave, were also occupied with that of the consistory. With regard to the latter, Cervini proposed that every bishop, or other prelate, should, on his election, make a profession of faith, and that bishops should be pledged to the observance of their duty of residence by the formula of their oath. In November the Cardinals dealt chiefly with those abuses which prevailed in the *Signatura gratiæ*. One reason for the state of things existing there was, it was said, to be found in the large number of officials, in consequence of which things happened for which the term used, "exorbitant," seems only too fitting. Complaints were especially made with regard to the laxity in the examination of

¹ SCHWEITZER has also been the first to bring these two protocols to light (57, 58) of which one (Concilio, LXXVIII., 72 *seqq.*) is in the Secret Archives of the Vatican, the other (Carte Cervini, XXXII., 17 *seqq.*) in the State Archives, Florence. In the Maffei Archives, Volterra, which, unfortunately are not well arranged, there are only a few unimportant letters of the Cardinal. Besides Cervini, Card. Mignatelli was also summoned to Rome by the *brief of September 28, 1552 (Arm. 41, t. 65, n. 636. Secret Archives of the Vatican).

² See Lasso's report in DRUFFEL, II., 825, and MASIVS, Lettere, 121. The commission does not seem to have possessed more than six members (see the Portuguese report of November 2, 1552, in the Corpo dipl. Port. VII., 193). When the names of the Cardinals are changed, this is explained by the fact that each of them had a representative.

candidates for Holy Orders in Rome, the acceptance of presents by the ordaining prelates, the non-observance of the canonical age, the bestowal of benefices on youths, connivance at the concubinage of higher clerics and other evil practices.¹ In December the views of the Spanish bishops were laid before the commission,² and on December 20th the Pope deliberated in a Congregation concerning the reform of plenary indulgences, desired by the commission of Cardinals.³

The work of the commission in January and February, 1553, was chiefly concerned with the duty of residence of the bishops, and it was not until the middle of March that the matter was so far arranged, that canons could be drawn up, whereupon the reform of the Penitentiary was next taken in hand.⁴

On April 17th, 1553, the Pope informed the members of the Sacred College, assembled in consistory, of the proposals of the reform commission, which were then read out, and he gave it as his opinion that a beginning should be made with the Bull concerning the conclave. All the Cardinals were to submit their views, so that after these had been examined, the final text of the Bull could be drawn up.⁵ That the Pope himself took a personal share in the work may be seen from the fact that he himself prescribed the subjects for the further deliberations of the commission, which lost a valuable member in July,

¹ See SCHWEITZER, 58-9.

² See Cervini's letter in DRUFFEL, II., 828.

³ See Camillo Capilupi's *report to Card. E. Gonzaga, dated Rome, December 21, 1552, in which he says :“ Hieri si fece una congregazione inanti S.Stà dove si parlò del modo che che si ha a tenere nel concedere queste indulgenze plenarie che vengono ogni di dimandate a S.Stà da questi r^{mi}, parendo ad alcuni card^{li} della riforma, che quest' usanza che si tiene del publicare dette indulgenze sia per essere cagione che vengano in dispreggio, attaccandosi per i cantoni delle strade stampate.” (Gonzaga Archives; Mantua).

⁴ See SCHWEITZER, 59-60 ; *cf.* MASIVS, Lettere, 118-9.

⁵ See Acta consist. in RAYNALDUS, 1553, n. 46 ; *cf.* SÄGMÜLLER, Papstwahlbullen, 26.

1553, through the death of Cardinal Maffei.¹ Two of the documents which the Pope dictated to Massarelli at the end of December, 1553, are still in existence.²

The year 1554 is described by experts as being the most fruitful period of work in the pontificate of Julius III.³ How fully this opinion is justified is shown by the collection of drafts, proposals and protocols concerning the reform negotiations of that period preserved in the Papal secret archives.⁴ From these we can understand with what true zeal this difficult task was handled in the numerous sittings. The deliberations, begun on January 1st, 1554, dealt with the entrance into the clerical state and the granting of benefices. From January 10th the commission was also occupied with the reform of monasteries. On January 14th the Florentine ambassador wrote of the favourable prospects for the realization of reform ; the disputes which had arisen in Spain concerning the meaning of several of the decrees of the Council of Trent also contributed to the acceleration of the work.⁵ In the later deliberations, the settlement of the duty of residence and the reform of the *Signatura* were more fully discussed than any other subjects before the commission. On February 12th the Pope personally took part in the deliberations, and declared that although the matters of reform were not yet fully settled, he considered it better that a part of the resolutions should now be published. To this end, a Bull should be drawn up, which was to introduce

¹ The Pope's sorrow at the loss of this man is brought out by Serristori in his *report of July 17, 1553 (State Archives, Florence). The death of Card. de Cupis (December 10, 1553), was also a great blow to him.

² More details in SCHWEITZER, 61. The Pope also speaks of the continuation of the reform work already begun, in his instructions for Delfino of December 1, 1553, see PIEPER, 183.

³ SCHWEITZER, 61.

⁴ *Concilio, LXXVIII., 248-9 (January, 1554), 285-6 (February, 1554), prepared by the indefatigable Massarelli, first used by SCHWEITZER (62).

⁵ See in Appendix No. 21a, Serristori's *report of January 14, 1554. (State Archives, Florence).

the matter, the draft of which should be sent to the Cardinals for their approval. Eight of these documents, among which are the opinions of Cardinals Morone and Carpi, are still preserved.¹

With regard to the summer of 1554 we have, unfortunately, up to the present, no detailed information, although there is a decree of Julius III. of this time, which ordains that no member of a religious order may, for the future, accept a bishopric without the consent of his Superior and the Protector of his order. At the end of November the Pope addressed earnest admonitions to the Cardinals to keep their dwellings and entourage in all modesty and propriety, and to distinguish themselves by well-doing and generosity to the poor.² In the same month the deliberations concerning the reform of the Papal election were also finally concluded. The Bulls to be issued on this matter, the improvement in which had been repeatedly discussed, remained as drafts, and their publication, in the opinion of the Florentine ambassador, would take place before the end of January, 1555.³ As, however, the work was taken in hand in the most painstaking manner, and the intention was to abolish all possible hindrances to a conscientious election, the new Bull concerning the conclave could only be read aloud in the consistory of November 12th, 1554, after which it was sent to the different Cardinals.⁴

The commission was above all occupied at that time with the question of the reform of the bishops. This part of the programme was so far worked out by the end of November, that its outlines could be read in the consistory and handed

¹ *Concilio, LXVIII., 226a, 353-370 (Secret Archives of the Vatican). Cf. SCHWEITZER, 62.

² See *Acta consist. in Consistorial Archives; SCHWEITZER, 64-5.

³ *Letter of Serristori of January 26, 1553 (State Archives, Florence).

⁴ See *Acta consist. in Consistorial Archives; RAYNALDUS, 1554, n. 23; SÄGMÜLLER, Papstwahlbullen, 27-8, 291-2; SCHWEITZER, 63.

to all the Cardinals for approval.¹ In December a draft for the reform of the seculars and regulars was also prepared, to which the Cardinals likewise gave their sanction.² A draft from the hand of Julius III. himself proves that he was also, at this time, engaged upon the reform of the College of Cardinals.³ At the end of January, 1555, the Pope was able to inform the King of Spain that he had succeeded, in spite of the opposition of clergy and laity, in preparing a comprehensive Reform Bull, which would soon appear.⁴ The death of the Pope intervened and prevented this; the official document is preserved in the Papal secret archives.⁵ It begins, in accordance with the original plan drawn up by Julius III. himself, with the Pope and Cardinals, then passing on to the bishops, the ordination of the clergy, the bestowal of benefices, the Signatura, the Penitentiary and the regular clergy. Besides these points, the explanation of the Holy Scriptures, and the nature and preaching of Indulgences, are also dealt with. A special Reform Bull for the Penitentiary had already been drawn up, which had not yet been made public, but which, it seems, had already in many respects been carried into practice.⁶

When the work of Julius III. for reform is impartially considered, it becomes quite clear to us that it must in no way be judged in such a depreciatory manner as was done by his contemporaries,⁷ and the investigators who followed

¹ See *Concilio, LXXVIII., 331-2 (Secret Archives of the Vatican); SCHWEITZER, 63-4. In Appendix No. 24 Serristori's *report of December 1, 1554 (State Archives, Florence).

² See *Concilio, LXXVIII., 339-40; SCHWEITZER, 64.

³ See *Concilio, LXXVIII., 344.

⁴ See the instructions for A. Agostino in LAEMMER, Mantissa, 169-70; cf. SÄGMÜLLER, Papstwahlbullen, 28-9.

⁵ *Reformatio, quae addenda erat per Julium III. Pont. Max., 1555, sed non conclusa. Concilio, LXXVIII., 374 *seqq.* (Secret Archives of the Vatican).

⁶ Cf. GÖLLER, II., 1, 121-2.

⁷ Especially by Seripando, whose judgment was first published by HÖFLER in the Abhandlungen der Münchner Akademie, IV., 3,

them.¹ It is absolutely false to say that Julius III. had done nothing with regard to this most important question. As a matter of fact, he once more took up the reform work of Paul III., showed the most lively interest in it, and employed himself in the most painstaking way with the reform of the College of Cardinals, the conclave, the Dataria, the Signatura and the Penitentiary. If conclusive results were not attained this was in no way owing to any unwillingness or want of activity on the part of the Pope; there can be no possible doubt as to his earnest desire and efforts to attain the desired end. It is also due to him that a great deal of preparatory work was done, without which the later reforms could not have been carried out. The appointment of new Cardinals holds a much more important place in the diplomatic correspondence of the times of Julius III. than the work of reform in the Church. As Cosimo de' Medici and Charles V. both knew the compliant disposition of the Pope, they at once began to urge him to put an end to the preponderance of the adherents of France in the Sacred College, at one decisive blow, by a great creation of Cardinals. The Florentine ambassador, Serristori, was, above all, active in urging this. He had already, immediately after the election of Julius III., drawn the attention of Cosimo de' Medici to the danger of the hopes of the hated Cardinal Salviati being in all probability crowned with success in the next conclave. As he found little sympathy for his schemes on the part of the Pope, the ambassador endeavoured to win over the influential Cardinal Crescenzi.² Cosimo de' Medici pointed out to Julius III., by a letter in his own hand, of February 10th, 1551, the danger that would result from a

53, and afterwards printed by CALENZIO (*Documenti*, III., 222). CANTÙ has already noticed (*Eretici*, II., 8) that the document on reform made public by O. Gratius is a forgery.

¹ As is the case with RANKE, DRUFFEL, MAURENBRECHER and even with REUMONT (III., 2, 512). SCHWEITZER (51-52) was the first to state the truth from the original documents, after SÄGMÜLLER (*Papstwahlbullen*, 24-25) had already disputed the traditional opinion.

² Cf. Legaz. de Serristori, 241-2, 254-5.

Pope following him who would be quite devoted to France, and that only a corresponding increase in the Sacred College could obviate this disaster.¹ Even should the Pope raise strong objections to such a proceeding, Serristori still believed that the war about Parma would force him to this step,² and, indeed, Julius III. addressed a letter to the Emperor on July 27th, 1551, in which he complained of the intrigues of the French party with regard to the Papal election, and declared that he would, and that before All Saints, appoint new Cardinals. Charles V. thereupon requested that the four Spanish Cardinals already in the Sacred College should be strengthened by the appointment of eight new ones. To the remark of the nuncio, Bertano, that eight was too many, he agreed that four would be sufficient.³ No special names were referred to at this time by the Emperor, but serious difficulties arose when the question had to be treated in detail. Julius III. was agreeable to the appointment of Pighino and Bertano, but was strongly opposed to the elevation of the Archbishops of Palermo and Otranto. The matter was still further complicated by the demand of Charles V. that four Cardinals should be reserved *in petto*, upon whose names the Emperor should decide later.⁴ This last proposal Julius III., with perfect justification, refused to accept. His irresolution and the difficulty of his position were further increased by the threats of the French, who craftily represented that the restoration of peace would only be possible if their king were not irritated.⁵ To the fear of a French schism was added the consideration which had to be shown with regard to the prelates of the Council, besides the fact that other powers also were urging the claims of their candidates in a creation of Cardinals. While the representatives of France were working for the advancement of Louis

¹ DESJARDINS, III., 241-2.

² Legaz. di Serristori, 264; *cf.* 279.

³ See DRUFFEL, III., 252 (*cf.* I., 732); Nuntiaturberichte, XII., 75-6.

⁴ See DRUFFEL, III., 243-4, 254.

⁵ Legaz. di Serristori, 288.

de Guise, a brother of the Cardinal of Lorraine, Serristori, was actively engaged on behalf of Luigi and Giovanni, sons of Cosimo I.¹

It is no wonder that the Pope, irresolute by nature as he was, deferred the decision of the matter. A letter of Bertano, of November 12th, 1551, urging him to wait no longer, and thus avoid new complications,² at length put an end to his hesitation, and on November 20th the first great creation of Cardinals of Julius III. took place.³ All the eleven who were

¹ See Legaz. di Serristori, 285. In his *letter to Cosimo I. on November 27, 1551, Julius III. made excuses for the non-appointment of Luigi (Addit. MSS. 8,366, p. 17b., British Museum).

² Nuntiaturberichte, XII., 102.

³ Only two Cardinals had been appointed previously: Innocenzo del Monte on May 30, 1550 (*cf. supra* p. 69 *seq.*), and on October 12, 1551, the Croatian Paulist monk, George Utissenich (*cf.* DRUFFEL, III., 253-4; RAYNALDUS, 1551, n. 71-2) who enjoyed his dignity but a short time as he was put to death by the authorized agent of Ferdinand I., on December 17, 1551, on a false suspicion of carrying on traitorous dealings with the Turks (see BUCHOLTZ, VII., 283; KRONES, Östr. Gesch., III., 216 *seqq.*; HUBER in the Archiv. für Östr. Gesch., LXXV., 528-9, 539, 541; PLATZHOFF, Mordbefugnis, 41, Berlin, 1906). The news reached Rome on January 14, 1552 (Nuntiaturberichte, XII., 138; *cf.* also Serristori's *reports of January 19, and 22, 1552 (State Archives, Florence), where the representative of Ferdinand I., Diego Lasso, did not succeed in gaining anything further than that his master was absolved, on January 30, until a stricter examination "ad cautelam" took place, from the ecclesiastical punishment to which the murderer of a Cardinal was liable. Ferdinand had to take an oath before the nuncio, Martignano, "de parendo nostris et ecclesiae mandatis" (see THEINER, Mon. Slav. merid., II., 30; DRUFFEL, II., 86-7). A very searching examination followed, in which 116 witnesses were heard, and then long negotiations ensued. It was not until February 14, 1555, that the Papal sentence was finally pronounced, that the King and the murderer of the Cardinal were not liable to punishment, and deserved none (see BUCHOLTZ, IX., 612-13, and UTIEŠENOVICH, Lebensgesch. des Kard. Georg, Vienna, 1881, Append. 73). Concerning the Cardinal's relations to the Reformation in Hungary and

appointed were Italians ; Sebastiano Pighino was added to these, but out of consideration for his position at the Council, he remained reserved *in petto*, and his creation was only published on May 30th, 1552.¹

The most able of the new Cardinals² were undoubtedly the Papal private secretary, Girolamo Dandino, and the Archbishop of Bari, Jacopo dal Pozzo, known under the name of Puteo. Besides Pozzo, Giammichele Saraceni and the Bishop of Albenga, Giambattista Cicada, distinguished themselves among the new Cardinals by their learning, while Pietro Bertano, then acting as nuncio at the court of the Emperor, and the Sienese, Fabio Mignanelli, were experienced diplomatists. The two nephews of Julius III., Cristoforo del Monte and Fulvio della Corgna, were also worthy of the purple. Corgna displayed, as Bishop of Perugia, very remarkable activity in the cause of Catholic reform. Two of the other Cardinals appointed at this time, Giovanni Poggio and Alessandro Campegio, proved clearly, like Corgna, the ecclesiastical spirit which animated them, by their protection of the Jesuits. Giovanni Ricci, originally from Montepulciano, owed the red hat to his skill in business affairs, by which he had made himself indispensable to Julius III. ; his manner of life was not blameless, but later he entered on a better course.³ In

Siebenbürgen, see SCHWICKER, in the Oestr. Vierteljahrsschrift für Kath. Theologie, 1867, 397-8.

¹ See FIRMANUS, 499.

² Concerning the promotion of November 20, 1551, see Acta consist. in GULIK, 35-6 ; DRUFFEL, I., 811-2, 820, III., 239-40 ; Nuntiaturberichte, XII., n. 108. Concerning the personality of the different Cardinals, see *Contelorius in the Secret Archives of the Vatican, XI., 49, and CIACONIUS, III., 768, *seqq.* ; CARDELLA, IV., 306-7 (with wrong date December 20th) ; *cf.* PALLAVICINI, 13, 1-2.

³ Friedensburg and Kupke give an account of Bertano's previous life in the Nuntiaturberichte, XI., xviii. ; XII., xix. *seq.* ; *cf.* MERKLE, II., 321 n. 2, and LAUCHERT, 671. After the death of Bertano, Claudio Malopera* wrote on March 12, 1558, to Card. Madruzzo : " Era un huomo da bene et molto dotto " (Vice-regal

the year 1557 he interested himself greatly in bringing the Jesuits to Montepulciano.¹ In the appointment of Gianandrea Mercurio the Pope took into consideration the important services which he had rendered him as secretary,² while Julius III. was still a Cardinal, and in the case of the Venetian patrician, Luigi Cornaro, the recommendation of the Republic of St. Mark had great weight.

As far as the political views of the new Cardinals were concerned, the experienced agent of Cardinal Ercole Gonzaga gave it at once as his opinion that most of them would incline more to the French than to the Imperial side.³ The complaint of the French, that Julius III. had only undertaken the increase of the Sacred College in the interests of Charles V., proved to be quite unfounded.⁴

Requests that the Pope would undertake a further creation were repeatedly made in the time that immediately followed ; the French were especially active in endeavouring in every way to get their former candidate, Louis de Guise, appointed,⁵ and

Archives, Innsbruck). Concerning Mignanelli see *Nuntiaturberichte*, III., 41, 42 ; VIII., 10, 11 ; MERKLE, I., 162, and besides the eye-witnesses, quoted in previous note, also AZZOLINI, *Le Pompe Sanesi*, I., 83, 84, Pistoia, 1649. Concerning Cicada, *cf.* also MAROCCO, *Monumenti*, IV., 89, 92, concerning Poggio, see GARAMPI, 286 ; and HINOJOSA 87 ; concerning Ricci, see GARAMPI 289 ; MERKLE, I., 149, 194 ; MACSWINEY, *Portugal*, III. 216, and especially L. MELE, **Genealogia d. famiglia Ricci* (Ricci Archives, Rome). F. della Corgna afterwards built himself a magnificent palace near Perugia, now the Villa Umberto I., which Zuccaro embellished with paintings.

¹ *Cf.* Vol., V. 109 of the " *Istromenti e lettere* " in Ricci Archives, Rome.

² *Cf.* BOGLINO, 45 *seqq.*, CAMPORI, CIII. d.s. pontefici, 7.

³ See *Nuntiaturberichte*, XII., 94, n. 1.

⁴ See RIBIER, II., 357-8 ; ROMIER, 52 ; ADRIANI, VIII., 5 ; SÄGMÜLLER, *Papstwahlen*, 199.

⁵ See in Appendix No. 20, the *report of C. Titio of March 14, 1553 (State Archives, Florence).

in the Curia itself there were only too many aspirants.¹ Julius III. was repeatedly offered large sums from this quarter, but, great as the need of financial aid was at this time, the Pope would have nothing to do with such shameful bargains.² It need hardly be said that the relatives of Julius were also active in begging for consideration. As the Pope often changed his mind, it was, however, difficult for the ambassadors to foresee what would actually take place. The well-informed Serristori was, at anyrate, in a position to report to Florence on October 26th, 1553, the promotion of Guise, of two relatives of the Pope, and of an Imperial candidate not yet definitely settled, as being extremely probable.³ This promotion was confidently expected by many on November 29th; Serristori learned at the last moment from the Pope's brother that the settlement of the matter had been postponed, but certainly not over the Ember Days, and that the number was provisionally settled at four.⁴ This proved to be the case, and the creation of four Cardinals finally took place on December 22nd, 1553. Besides the Imperialist Archbishop of Palermo, Pietro Tagliavia, two very youthful relatives of the Pope, Roberto de' Nobili and Girolamo Simoncelli, received the purple on that day, while Henry II. ought to have been satisfied by the elevation of Louis de Guise.⁵ Tagliavia, renowned

¹ The Pope complained of this; see the *letter of Ipp. Capilupi to Card. E. Gonzaga of November 22, 1553 (Gonzaga Archives, Mantua).

² See Serristori's **report of November 26, 1553 (State Archives, Florence).

³ **Letter of October 26, 1553 (State Archives, Florence). Cf. Report of the Portuguese Ambassador of October 22, 1553, in *Corpo Dipl. Port.*, VII., 266.

⁴ Serristori's **letter of November 28, 1553 (State Archives, Florence). Cf. Report of the Portuguese ambassador of November 11, 1553 in *Corpo Dipl. Port.*, VII., 272.

⁵ Concerning the creation of December 22, 1553, see Serristori's *reports of December 21 and 22, 1553 (State Archives, Florence); *Acta consist.* in GULIK, 36-37; RIBIER, II., 480-1; *Corpo Dipl. Port.*, VII., 306-7; *CONTELORIUS, *loc. cit.*; CIACONIUS, III.,

far and wide for his boundless love of the poor, is universally acknowledged to have been an admirable man. Roberto de' Nobili was a Cardinal upon whom the representatives of the Catholic reform party could rest their greatest hopes. Highly gifted from an intellectual point of view—he is said to have spoken Latin and Greek at ten years of age—he distinguished himself still more by his great piety. Like Aloysius of Gonzaga, whom he specially resembles, he was most scrupulously pure of heart. He could never do enough in his ascetic exercises; he fasted strictly, slept on a board, wore a hair shirt, assisted at Mass every day, listened frequently to sermons and often received Holy Communion, and from motives of humility would not allow his portrait to be painted. A beautiful letter of consolation which he addressed to a sick friend testifies, among other things, to the depth of his sincere piety. The favour which he enjoyed from Julius III. was only used to assist the needy. He repeatedly thought of renouncing the dignity of Cardinal and of retiring into a religious order, but his confessor, the Jesuit, Polanco, dissuaded him from this

784-5; CARDELLA, IV., 331-2. Concerning Tagliavia, *cf.* also MASSARELLI, 325, and BOGLINO, 46-7; concerning Simoncelli, see MERKLE's note to Firmanus, 502; concerning the appointment of Guise, a *brief of Julius III. to the Cardinal of Lorraine, dat. 1553, December 22, in the Min. brev. Arm. 41, t. 69, n. 809; *ibid.* n. 812, a *brief to R. de' Nobili of same date, in which the Pope makes the following remark, as a postscript, concerning the reason for the promotion: "quamquam et ingravescentis nostrae aetatis cogitatio et charissimorum consanguineorum nostrorum quotidianae flagitationes, non nihil nos, ut humanos, ut idipsum maturaremus perpulerunt." It was originally intended that Ambrosius Catharinus should also have received the purple at that time; Julius III. had in 1552 appointed him Archbishop of Conza, but he died on November 8th, 1553 (see SCHWEITZER, A. Catharinus, 229-230, Münster, 1910). Ipp. Capilupi also names Mons. d'Arras in the *letter of November 22, 1553, quoted *supra* p. 175 n. 1, as a probable candidate (Gonzaga Archives, Mantua). A Bull issued on January 26, 1554, forbade two brothers to be Cardinals at the same time; see Bull., VI., 475-6.

step. Assisted by him, he died, after a painful illness, with the most perfect resignation to the Divine Will, on January 18th, 1559. Men like Charles Borromeo, Bellarmine and Baronius venerated this Cardinal so early called away to a better life as a Saint.¹

Julius III. would gladly have welcomed another man, who possessed the same distinguished qualities as de' Nobili, into the Senate of the Church. This was the Duke of Gandia, Francis Borgia, a great grandson of Alexander VI. Borgia had come to Rome on October 23rd, 1550, stayed with the Jesuits,² and several days later was received by the Pope. It was believed that he had come to Rome on account of the Jubilee, and only very few were aware that Francis Borgia had already entered the Society of Jesus as early as 1548, but had received permission from Paul III. to retain his position as prince for three years longer.³ This period he employed to marry his elder children, to arrange his affairs, and to conclude the theological studies he had begun in 1546 by passing his examination as doctor on August 20th, 1550. As his eldest

¹ Besides the biographies of Turigio (1632) and Bartolucci (1675), see especially NARDO, *Vita del card. Rob. Nobili*, Urbino, 1728. PARIGI (*Notizie del card. R. Nobili*, Montepulciano, 1836) gives hardly anything new. The letter of condolence, which merited a place in the collection of Reumont, in NARO, 20-1. Julius III. gave Nobili excellent teachers in Giulio Poggiano and Ottavio Pantagato (*Cf. TIRABOSCHI*, VII., I, 28 [Roman edition]). As to the Cardinal's death, see MASSARELLI, 329, who bestows the greatest praise on him, and " *Avviso di Roma " of January 21, 1559, in Cod. Urb. 1039 of the Vatican Library. The epitaph of Nobili in FORCELLA, V., 254. A. Cervini also says, in the **Vita di Marcello II.* (*cf. Vol. XIV. of this work*) of R. Nobili: " Questo mirabilmente risplende in tutte le virtù morali come cristiane, ma il mondo non fu degno di cosa sì pura " (Library in Ferrara). For the laudatory inscription which was placed in the Palazzo at Montepulciano, see the *Miscell. Montepul.* of the Ricci Archives, Rome.

² See *Cartas de S. Ignacio*, II., 534-5.

³ *Cf. our statements in Vol. XII., p. 96 seq. of this work.*

son had attained his majority in August, 1550, he intended handing over his dukedom to him and placing himself in Rome at the disposal of his superior, Ignatius of Loyola.¹

After Borgia had received, on January 5th, 1551, the necessary consent of the Emperor to the carrying out of his plan, he informed the Pope of the vows of his order, by which he was bound, and of his intention to renounce all worldly honours. Julius III., nevertheless, formed the plan of making this distinguished prince a Cardinal. This, however, Borgia evaded, by flying at the approach of darkness on the night of February 4th, 1551, to the little Basque town of Oñate in Guipuzcoa.² Here he relinquished, after the arrival of the Emperor's permission, all his estates, rents and titles, by a notarial document of May 11th, 1551, and began his new life by going about the streets of Oñate, clad in the simple habit of the Jesuits, and carrying a beggar's sack to collect alms.

This change of life, in the case of a man of such high rank, caused the greatest sensation. Julius III. had granted a plenary indulgence for the devout assistance at Borgia's first public Mass, which he had to say on November 15th in the open air ; 12,000 persons had flocked together for this occasion and he distributed Holy Communion to more than 1240 of the faithful.

Borgia afterwards rendered his Order the greatest services, first as a preacher, and then as General, through the reputation in which he was held as well as through his talent for administration. By two large donations, he rendered it possible for Ignatius of Loyola to found the Roman College of the Society of Jesus, an educational establishment which soon overshadowed the University of Rome, in the wealth of its teaching power and the excellence of its curriculum.³

¹ P. SUAUV, Hist. de S. François de Borgia, 210 *seqq.* Paris, 1910. ASTRAIN, I., 290 *seqq.* The doctor's diploma for Borgia, of August 20, 1550, in Sanctus Franciscus Borgia, II., 703 ; his will, of August 26, 1550, *ibid.* I., 537 *seqq.*

² Mon. Ign. Ser. I., iii., 353 ; iv., 257, 430.

³ Polanco, September 14, 1555 ; Mon. Ign. Ser., I., x., 608.

When Charles V. again proposed this eminent Spaniard for the cardinalate, in March, 1552, Julius III. was inclined to grant his request,¹ but Ignatius of Loyola went himself to the Pope and represented to him that it would be of far greater service to the glory of God if the former Duke of Gandia were to remain in the humble position he himself had chosen.² Julius III. allowed himself to be persuaded, and even remarked that he also would prefer the position of a simple Jesuit to his own, for "you only require to think how you can serve God best, while we have many obstacles which distract us."³ The Pope, however, would not decide the matter against the wishes of Borgia; the latter remained silent and thus the affair appeared to be settled.

It was, nevertheless, the general opinion that a grandee of Spain could not remain a simple priest. Already by 1554 the former Duke was repeatedly proposed for the red hat by Charles V. and Philip II., while a report of unknown origin was current among the Roman as well as the Spanish Jesuits in that year that he would this time accept the purple.⁴ These rumours, however, proved to be unfounded, and Borgia induced the Spanish king to abandon his plan, through the influence of the Princess Juana, the sister of Philip II., and his representative during her brother's absence in England, while Julius was again turned from his purpose by Ignatius.⁵ At the latter's instigation, Borgia was at that time the first of the Society of Jesus to take that vow, through which the Constitution of the order endeavoured, as far as possible, to prevent the aspiration after places of honour, and the wish to mitigate the poverty imposed by the Rule.⁶

¹ Cf. SUAUI, 270.

² Mon. Ign. Ser. I., iv., 255 *seqq.*, 283 *seq.*

³ *Ibid.* 257.

⁴ Polanco to Nadal, May 15, 1554; Mon. Ign. Ser. I., vi., 712 *seq.*; Nadal to Borgia, June 17, 1554; Nadal, Epist. I., 265 *seq.*

⁵ POLANCO, IV., 494-5.

⁶ *Ibid.*, 592. S. Franc. Borgia, III., 174.

CHAPTER VII.

SPREAD OF THE SOCIETY OF JESUS.—THEIR REFORMING ACTIVITIES IN SPAIN, PORTUGAL, ITALY AND GERMANY.

THE friendly relations of Julius III. with the Jesuits dated from the time of the Council of Trent, where the Pope, as Legate, had become acquainted with the distinguished qualities of several members of the Order, and had learned to appreciate them. Except for a temporary misunderstanding in the year 1553,¹ he remained more favourably inclined to the Society of Jesus than to any of the other reform orders,² during the

¹ Cf. O. MANAREUS, *De Rebus Soc. Jesu*, 121 *seqq.*, Florence, 1886.

² Julius III. confirmed and increased the privileges of the Barnabites, by two Bulls, of February 22 and August 11, 1550 (see *Litt. et constit. cleric. S. Pauli*, 17 *seqq.*, 25 *seqq.*; the second Bull in Bull. VI., 426-7. Cf. also BARELLI, 232 *seqq.*, 235, 245-6, 249). On the recommendation of Card. Carafa, Julius III., also confirmed, by the Bull of June 10, 1551, all the privileges of the Theatines. (Original in the General Archives of the Theatines in Rome. See SILOS, I., 308 *seqq.*; cf. also MAGGIO, *Vita di Maria Carafa*, 279, Naples, 1670). By the *brief of October 4, 1552, for Ludovico infante Portug., Julius III. gave permission that the congregation founded by Martinus, O. Min. in the diocese of Lisbon, and confirmed by the Holy See, should wear the *cuculla* of the Italian Capuchins. Arm. 41, t. 66. n. 651; *ibid.* t. 67, n. 13 a *brief for Card. Messanens., that Bernardus Balbanus, O. Cap., who had expounded the gospel during the past year amid a great concourse of people, and whom the public also wished to have for this year, might continue his mission of preaching, dated January 8 1553 (Secret Archives of the Vatican). According to MAROCCO, *Monumenti*, I., 140-1, the Capuchins founded a mission in Colle-

whole of his pontificate. By a Bull of August 21st, 1552, he instituted and delivered to the Jesuits the German College, of the increasing importance of which mention will often be made. A Bull of October 22nd of the same year not only confirmed all the privileges of the Order, but added important ones thereto, especially the authorization bestowed on the General and on the superiors of the order to invest the students of their colleges with the degree of doctor. The greatest benefit, however, which Julius III. conferred on the Society of Jesus consisted in the Bull, already published on July 21st, 1550, which confirmed the Order anew, supplementing anything that might be wanting in the bull of Paul III., and completing everything in the sense and spirit of the holy founder.¹

That a new confirmation of the Society of Jesus would have to be sought from the Apostolic See was very soon apparent.² Many things were not so clearly expressed in the Bull of foundation as to exclude the idea that it would be advantageous to supplement and explain it more fully, but the draft for the new Bull was not seriously taken in hand till 1547. It was clear that this must possess four qualities ; first, completeness, so that it might show forth all the essential points of the constitution of the Order ; secondly, it must possess a certain breadth of expression, so as not to render useful alterations impossible ; thirdly, clearness, and fourthly, a really devotional

vecchio in the Sabine district in 1552. Concerning the promotion of Peter of Alcantara by Julius III., see the *Freiburger Kirchlex.*, IX., 1862. Proofs of favour for the Dominicans in RIPPOLL-BRÉMOND, V., 15 *seqq.* On January 30, 1551, Julius III. approved of the reformed statutes of the Augustinians (see EMPOLI, Bull. ord. Erem. S. Aug., Romae, 1628, 214-215 ; *cf.* PAULUS, Hoffmeister, 168). On October 24, 1551, Julius confirmed the indulgences for the devotional exercise of the Forty Hours Prayer (*Quarant' Ore*) introduced by the new Reform Order ; see SALA, *Docum. di S. Carlo Borromeo*, II., 117 *seq.*

¹ The three documents in the Bull., VI., 422 *seqq.*, 459 *seqq.*, 464 *seqq.* See also *Inst. Soc. Iesu*, I., *seqq.*, 29 *seqq.*, Florence, 1892.

² *Constitutiones Soc. Iesu latinae et hispanicae*, App. 306, Madrid, 1892.

character, so that of those who read it, and felt drawn to the Order, those whose vocation was genuine might remain, while those who were not suitable might be frightened away. Much work was necessary in order to meet these requirements, as the Bull had to be altered or supplemented in more than a hundred places.¹ The draft finally accepted contained, indeed, all the principles peculiar to the Jesuit Order, so as to make it for ever its foundation stone.²

This matter, which was, in essential points, briefly outlined in the Papal Bull, Ignatius now began, in the same year 1547, to elaborate in the constitutions of his Order. By 1550 these points were dealt with in the first draft, and fully completed by 1552 in the second, which Ignatius never altered, except superficially, before his death in 1556. They were at once published in the Order, and introduced, by way of experiment, first by Nadal in Sicily in the year 1552, in the following year in Spain and Portugal, and by Ribadeneira in North Germany.³

¹ *Ibid.*, 330 *seqq.*, ASTRAIN, I., 126, *seqq.*

² An enumeration of the most important deviations from the text of the Bulls of Paul III. in ASTRAIN, I., 133.

³ Cf. Vol. XII. of this work, p. 59 *seqq.* In many handbooks of Church history and in the reference books (ERSCH & GRUBER, Allgemeine Enzyklopädie der Wissenschaften und Künste, Sect. 2, XLI., 195 *seqq.*, Leipsic, 1887; cf. XV. 433-4) Lainez is represented as the organizer of the Jesuit order, and described as the co-founder who was the first to draw up the constitutions of the order in their final form. This view is not tenable according to the information afforded by the authorities. It is true that Ignatius consulted Lainez, as he did others; Ignatius himself says that the idea of establishing colleges originated with Lainez (Mon. Ign. Ser. 4, I., 220); his influence, however, is not authenticated beyond this. The first general congregation in 1558 makes it quite clear that the constitutions introduced in 1552 and confirmed by it, were drawn up by Ignatius (Decr. post. elect., 15, 53, 78). The same conviction is also frequently expressed by those in the confidence of Ignatius: Polanco, Nadal, Gonçalves, Ribadeneira, and Canisius; through these one can learn all the details of the history of the development of the constitutions. The contrary view, which makes Lainez the co-founder or the real founder of the order, a rose

Full authority was given to them in the first General Congregation of the Order in 1558.

After the publication of the constitutions the life work of Ignatius was essentially completed. At the death of Julius III., the last year of his own life was drawing near, and during this he could not undertake much that was new. Under Paul IV. he was to see, not only the Roman and German colleges, but his whole work, threatened with annihilation, without having any other defence to offer than his own heroic trust in God. Ever-increasing illness warned him of the approach of death ; indeed, he had already believed that the end had come

very late and is supported by nobody who has really studied the sources of Jesuit history. As the constitutions confirmed in the first general congregation contained the declarations as well (Decr. post elect., 24, 25, 31, 38, 41, 42, 54, 55, 57, 58, 68, 69, 78) there can at least be no idea that these originated with Lainez and were added to the constitutions at the first general congregation (as in HERZOG-HAUCK, *Realenzyklopädie für protestantische Theologie und Kirche*, 1900, VIII., 747, 769). Theoph. Raynaud was of opinion that the declaration to the Const. P., 4c., 14, 1, was composed by Lainez during the life of Ignatius and sanctioned by him (*Opera*, XVIII., 167, Lyons, 1665). Bayle understood this to mean that Lainez had drawn up the whole of the declarations (*Dictionnaire*, III., 139, Basle, 1741). This assertion of Bayle was taken up by others, but of late non-Catholic historians seem to be again giving up these views. GOTHEIN, 405-408, does not mention any co-operation in the composition of the constitutions, and HERZOG-HAUCK, *Realenzyklopädie*, VIII., 746 names Ignatius alone as "creator" of the organisation of the order, although he is not credited with the declarations. Herm. Müller endeavoured (*Les origines de la Compagnie de Jésus. Ignace et Lainez*, Paris, 1908) to prove from an Arabian text (of the XIXth century) that Ignatius had drawn from Islamic sources, especially in his precepts concerning obedience, and that Lainez had altered the constitutions after him, and had therefore become the real organizer of the order. F. HUBERT wrote against him in the *Theol. Literaturzeitung*, 1899, 310-1 ; JOS. BRUCKER in the *Études*, December 5, 1898, 705-709 ; H. THURSTON in the *Month*, XCIV. (1899), 518-526.

in 1550, and he joyfully awaited his dissolution.¹ On January 30th, 1551, after the first draft of the constitutions had been sanctioned by the members of the Order assembled in Rome, he expressed the desire to relinquish the dignity of General.² He was confined to his bed during almost the whole of the year 1554, so that a representative had to be chosen for him on November 1st, in the person of Nadal.³ He quickly recovered, however, after his unskilful physician, whom Ignatius obeyed implicitly, had been replaced by a better one,⁴ but in the middle of July, 1556, he gave up temporary affairs for ever, and in the morning of July 31st the soul of the saint, who had spent himself for the greater glory of God, passed to the vision of its Creator.⁵

Sixteen years had not yet passed since the life work of the dead Saint had been first crowned with the approbation of the Holy See, on September 27th, 1540. Ten unknown strangers, whom the people had mocked at a short time before on account of their broken Italian, and spitefully designated as heretics, had at that time been named in the Papal brief as members of the Society of Jesus. Now, the new order was spread over the four quarters of the globe, as far as Japan, Brazil, Abyssinia and even the Congo; the members of the Order numbered some 1500⁶ as early as 1554, and in the following year the number of missions amounted to 65.⁷ Among the members, doctors

¹ Mon. Ign. Ser. 4, I., 56.

² *Ibid.* Ser. 1, III., 303. Cartas de S. Ignacio, II., 295.

³ Mon. Ign. Ser. 1, VIII., 42; Ser. 4, I., 169.

⁴ *Ibid.* Ser. 4, I., 169.

⁵ See POLANCO, VI., 35. The exceedingly simple rooms in which Ignatius of Loyola lived from 1544 till his death (*cf.* TACCHI VENTURI in the Studi e docum. XX., 316-17), have been spared at the building of the professed house, out of veneration for the holy founder of the order, and converted into chapels, and are in existence at the present day. The low narrow rooms contain countless inscriptions and costly mementoes. Further details in the interesting pamphlet "Les chambres de S. Ignace de Loyola au Jésus de Rome." Rome, 1900.

⁶ POLANCO, IV., 476.

⁷ *Ibid.* V., n. 6.

from the first universities, and nobles from the greatest families were to be found. As Papal nuncios, they had penetrated to Ireland, Poland, Egypt and Japan ; as theologians they had shone at the Council of Trent ; as preachers they had attracted great notice at the universities of Louvain and Salamanca, and at the courts of Valladolid, Brussels and Vienna ; as missionaries they had reawakened Christian life in districts where it had seemed extinct, and as instructors of youth they had, with unostentatious activity, raised up a new generation of zealous Catholics. The outward organization of the Order had also made much progress. Portugal could, as early as 1546, be constituted as a separate province,¹ with its own provincial superiors. Spain followed in 1547², and after that one or more new provinces were added every year, until, in 1556, these numbered twelve, including Abyssinia. The whole of this mighty edifice, had arisen as a logical development of the resolution, formed thirty-five years before on a sick bed in Loyola by a knight who had hitherto led a worldly life, and who was, till that moment, completely uneducated and untrained from an intellectual point of view. From such an insignificant germ had this wonderful development come, in spite of continual opposition, persecution and calumny.

The strongest response to the idea of Loyola was naturally to be found in Spain. The old Catholic ideals, for the most part untainted by the innovations in religion, were still paramount there, and, unlike the Catholics in other lands, people still had the courage and enthusiasm to fight for them. The struggle for the defence and propagation of the faith had been a powerful incentive, not so long before, in the wars against the Moors, and in the voyages of discovery, and when Ignatius showed how this fight could be continued with spiritual weapons, it was bound to meet with an enthusiastic response. As a matter of fact, among the first six followers of Loyola, we find, besides one Portuguese and one Savoyard, four Spaniards, and for a long time to come, the founder's own

¹ Mon. Ign. Ser. I, I., 449.

² POLANCO, I., 247.

country provided him with those able disciples who were all the more valuable to their master, as many of them only placed themselves at his disposal after they had completed their studies as doctors of theology or law, or as experienced preachers or spiritual directors. One finds Spaniards, therefore, in almost every place where the new Order was at work.¹ The Spaniard Doménech planted it in Sicily, d'Eguia in France, Francis Xavier and Cosmo de Torres in India and Japan. Spaniards accompanied the Papal Legates to Poland and Germany, and were as eminent as theologians at the Roman College and in Paris as at Trent. The principal counsellors of Loyola were Spaniards, viz. : Polanco, Nadal and Lainez, while the first three Generals of the Order were also Spaniards.

The friendly reception which the creation of Loyola met with in his native land is evidenced by the large number of colleges which arose there within a very short time. Under Paul III. Valencia already had one in 1544 ; in 1545 Valladolid, Gandia and Barcelona followed ; in 1546 Alcalà, in 1548 Salamanca ; after the accession of Julius III., Burgos was founded in 1550, Medina del Campo in 1551, Oñate in 1552, and Cordova in 1553. In the year 1554, missions were established in Avila, Cuença, Placencia, Seville, Granada, Simanca (noviciate) and Sanlucar de Barameda, in 1555 in Murcia and Saragossa, and in 1556 a college in Monterrey in Galicia.² In the year 1554 139 Jesuits³ were already resident in these colleges, and in the first four months of the same year, nine able men entered the order in Alcalà and ten in Valencia. At the end of March Nadal received eleven students at Salamanca.⁴ Under Julius III. Ignatius had, by 1552, established two, and in 1554, three additional provinces of the Order in Spain, in accordance with a new classification : Castile, Aragon and Andalusia. He appointed a common superior for all the provinces of the peninsula in the person of Francis Borgia.⁵ The golden age of

¹ ASTRAIN, II., 567.

² *Ibid.* I., 257 *seqq.*, 298 *seqq.*, 412 *seqq.*

³ Inventory *ibid.* 409-411.

⁴ *Ibid.* I., 413 ; cf. 312-3, 315, 435 ; II., 244 *seqq.*

⁵ *Ibid.* I., 401. Cartas de S. Ignacio, IV., 9-10.

the Spanish provinces is, in no small degree, to be attributed to the zeal of Borgia and the esteem in which he was held.¹

What gave most edification in Spain on the part of the first Jesuits was the new life which they brought into the care of souls. There was at that time, a great deficiency of religious instruction for the people in the Iberian peninsula ; preaching was regarded as the prerogative of the monks, parish priests devoting so little attention to it that it actually gave offence if a secular priest made an appearance as a preacher.² It was, therefore, very much appreciated when the Jesuits made it their business to announce the Word of God in their churches, many of them passing through the country as travelling preachers, and taking up their abode for shorter or longer periods in different towns, to open out the way for a moral renovation of the people.³ Wonders are related of the success of the missionaries. In Alcalá, during the carnival of 1558, Antonio de Madrid, in an address lasting a quarter of an hour, induced all the prostitutes who, by order of the authorities, had to assemble before the doors of their houses, to give up their sinful calling.⁴ In Granada, Bautista Sanchez preached so impressively concerning the neglect of the poor in the hospital, that the audience at once offered gold rings, ear-rings and costly raiment for their relief, and, on the following day, sent generous alms to the institution and personally took part in the duty of attending to the poor.⁵ One result of their preaching was that religious life, and especially the reception of the Sacraments, was greatly improved. The number of confessions, not by any means very large, which is quoted as a proof of this,⁶ witnesses to the depths to which matters had sunk in this respect.⁷

¹ ASTRAIN, II., 104-5.

² *Ibid.* II., 502, 512, 519.

³ *Ibid.* 502 *seqq.*

⁴ *Ibid.* 506.

⁵ *Ibid.* 509.

⁶ In four months of the year 1564, 3500 confessions were heard in Valladolid, 5265 in Avila, 6300 in Salamanca. *Ibid.* 503.

⁷ It is significant that the Archbishop of Toledo forbade the faithful to communicate more frequently than once a year. POLANCO, II., 121 n. 287.

The new Order won all hearts, however, through its work in connection with the instruction of youth. Hitherto it had been quite unheard of that members of a religious order should engage in such an unlearned occupation.¹ It touched and affected people when the Jesuits, with a bell in their hands, now collected the children in the streets and took them in procession to the church to give them religious instruction. In Toledo, the people rushed to the windows at such an unusual sight, and gave praise to God.² The visits of the Jesuits to the prisons and hospitals, as well as their heroic self-sacrifice at the time of the plague, also served to win for them general respect and esteem. Many Jesuits lost their lives in the service of the sick.³

The teaching activity of the new Order in its colleges was of the greatest importance for ecclesiastical reform. As soon as instruction for externs began in these institutions, pupils flocked to them. The college of Murcia numbered 140 of these in the first two years of its existence. Belmonte in 1569 had some 400, Seville in 1561 about 500, Cordova 650 at the same period, and Monterrey in the fourth year of its existence 800.⁴ Such able clerics came from the college of Monterrey that it became a sort of proverb among the bishops: "He comes from Monterrey; therefore we can ordain him with full confidence."⁵ The college of Medina gave different Orders such able members that one superior said: "Let us leave aside our theological lectures and sermons, and confine ourselves to teaching grammar; we shall attain more in this way."⁶

If the Society of Jesus nowhere found more numerous friends than in Spain, it also nowhere else met with such violent opposition. The dislike of Archbishop Siliceo of

¹ ASTRAIN, II., 553.

² *Ibid.* II., 522-3.

³ *Ibid.* 525 *seqq.*

⁴ *Ibid.* 587-8.

⁵ Report of Father Valderrabano S. J. of the year 1562, *Ibid.* II., 574.

⁶ Report of Father Olea S. J. of the year 1563, *Ibid.* 576.

Toledo was clearly expressed in the reign of Julius III.¹ In October, 1551, he forbade all members of the new Order to practise their official priestly duties, and this prohibition was solemnly announced in all the churches of the archdiocese during High Mass. By this step, however, the archbishop had attacked the Papal privileges of the new Order, and thereby the honour of the Holy See. Julius III., therefore, addressed to Siliceo, on January 2nd, 1552, a letter in which he highly praised the Jesuits,² and the nuncio, Poggio, defended the oppressed Order most warmly. As Philip II. also declared himself against Siliceo, there was no other course open to him than to withdraw his decree.

A privilege of the older Orders, to the effect that no other monastery might be built within a radius of 140 yards, led to stormy manifestations in Saragossa against the Jesuit college opened there on April 17th, 1555.³ The Augustinians especially declared that their rights were infringed upon by the erection of the college. The archbishop took their part and the Jesuits were looked upon and treated as if they were excommunicated, the populace getting into a state of the greatest excitement against them. Matters went so far that the Jesuits had to leave the city on August 1st; the struggle, however, was decided in their favour on September 8th, and it became possible to re-open the college.

The attack on the book of the Exercises also continued during the whole pontificate of Julius III. In 1553, Siliceo appointed a commission for the examination of the accusations, which censured nineteen propositions.⁴ As, however, Paul III. had already confirmed the Exercises in 1548, the attacks did not succeed in winning much support.

The Order developed in Portugal even more rapidly than in Spain. Nothing under the sun was prized more highly in that

¹ *Ibid.* I., 351-365. Documents concerning the struggle, in the *Cartas de S. Ignacio*, III., 455-475.

² *Cartas de S. Ignacio*, III., 460.

³ *ASTRAIN*, I., 438 *seqq.*

⁴ *Ibid.* I., 366-384. The censure is printed in *POLANCO*, *Chron.*, III., App. 501 *seqq.*

country, says a shrewd observer,¹ than the king's favour, and the fatherly care of John III.,² whose relations with Julius III. were very friendly, was always accorded to the Jesuits, while his royal brothers, the Infantes Louis and Henry, followed the example of the king; the former, indeed, would willingly have entered the Order himself.³ The Cardinal and Grand Inquisitor, Henry, also interested himself in all the affairs of the Jesuits, "as if they had been his own."⁴

The enmities and difficulties with which the rising Society of Jesus had to struggle in Spain, did not, happily, assail them in the neighbouring country of Portugal. By the year 1552, the number of those who had entered the Order had risen to 318,⁵ among whom were to be found the sons of the Governor of Lisbon and the Grand Captain of Madeira.⁶ In the year 1551, the Cardinal-Infante, Henry, gave up his college in Evora⁷ to the Jesuits, which, by 1554, possessed 300 pupils; in 1555, the Order received the so-called Royal college of Coimbra,⁸ from John III., which formed part of the University; the Jesuits, however, soon relinquished this. In 1553, a second mission in Lisbon, the so-called professed house of St. Roch,

¹ POLANCO, IV., 558.

² This was expressly mentioned in the concessions with regard to the great military orders (*cf.* SCHÄFER, III., 85; V., 150, 156; and *Corpo Dipl. Port.*, VI. and VII. *passim*). In the year 1551 the Pope sent the Golden Rose to the eldest son of the King (see MACSWINEY, Portugal, III., 228 *seqq.*) and also made him other presents; see ANT. DE PORTUGAL DE FARIA, Portugal e Italia, 203-204, Lisbon, 1901; *cf. ibid.* 78-79 concerning the ecclesiastical relations with the Holy See. For the beatification of the Portuguese Gundisalvo, see NOVAES, VII., 91.

³ Cartas de S. Ignacio, IV., n. 268.

⁴ POLANCO, VI., 751, n. 3250.

⁵ Epist. mixtae, III., 25.

⁶ ASTRAIN, I., 586-7.

⁷ POLANCO, II., 377; III., 422; IV., 543. Paul IV. confirmed the granting of the college to the Jesuits on April 15 and September 20, 1559 (DELPLACE) Synopsis actorum S. Sedis in causa Soc. Iesu, I., 17, Florence, 1887.

⁸ POLANCO, V., 588-9.

was established,¹ while in the same year instruction for extern students was begun in the college of Lisbon,² at which the attendance in 1554 was 600.³ In the opinion of the public there was nobody like the Jesuits, and they had so much work to do in the care of souls and in imparting instruction that their numbers were not equal to the task.⁴

The opposition of the Grand Inquisitor, Cardinal Henry, preserved them from the heavy burden of being obliged to undertake the work of the tribunal of the Inquisition at Lisbon, thereby rendering, according to Polanco, a great service to the Order.⁵ Ignatius was put into great perplexity by the wish of the king in this matter, not, indeed on account of any principle being involved, but rather because the office of Inquisitor would be regarded as a sort of prelacy, and his Order was not permitted to accept any such dignities. He caused six of the most able Jesuits to consult on the matter for three days, and then resolved to submit the question to the decision of the king. When the answer reached Portugal the office of Inquisitor had, however, already been given to a Dominican.⁶

In spite of all this outward success, however, it was precisely in Portugal that the Order had to pass through a crisis such as had presented itself in no other country.⁷ There was no firm guiding hand there; Simon Rodriguez had proved himself inefficient in his position as provincial. In the reception of novices the selection was not sufficiently careful, and a striving after independence and a tendency towards worldliness began to make itself felt among the members of the Order, which, in the end, would

¹ NADAL, Epist., I., 197 seqq.

² POLANCO, III., 394, 402-3.

³ *Ibid.* IV., 524.

⁴ *Ibid.* II., 135-6, 676; IV., 527; V., 566.

⁵ "Prorsus de Societate benemeritus fuit, quod impedivit, ne id fieret." *Ibid.* V., 603, n. 1663.

⁶ *Ibid.* Mon. Ign. Ser. I, IX., 226; Ser. 4, I., 320, 327. Epist. Mixtae, IV., 702.

⁷ ASTRAIN, I., 585-629.

have led to the most evil consequences ; in addition to this, Rodriguez himself was endeavouring to make his province independent of the rest of the Order, and to form it according to his own ideas. The dissatisfaction of the insubordinate elements found open expression when Rodriguez was deposed in 1552. However, it was precisely in this crisis that Ignatius and his disciples showed in the clearest manner that they were determined to oppose the threatened disaster with inflexible energy. Some 130 members of the order, who refused to submit, were at once expelled, and Ignatius gave his sanction to this step on the part of his delegate, Torres.¹ In July, 1553, there only remained 105 Jesuits in Portuguese territory.²

Peace was again threatened in the beginning of 1553, when Rodriguez returned to Portugal and endeavoured to win over the court to his reinstatement. It was only in June, 1553, that he obeyed the order of Ignatius to repair to Rome. He thereupon insisted that his case should be formally and justly examined. After some hesitation, however, he submitted to the decision of the judge, which proved to be unfavourable to him.³ In the meanwhile the constitutions of the order had been published in Portugal, and on this foundation the Portuguese province took a new lease of life.

In Italy, a specially wide field of work was displayed for the reforming activities of the order. The reports of the Jesuit missionaries, as well as other sources, show how neglect of religion had increased in that country to an almost incredible extent. The missionaries often complain that the people are, for the most part, ignorant of the commonest prayers,⁴ and that persons are to be met with who have not been to confession

¹ Brief of December 18th, 1552 : Mon. Ign. Ser. 1, IV., 559 *seqq.*

² Epist. Mixtae, III., 397.

³ Letter of Luis Gonçalvez of May 20, 1554 : Epist. Mixtae, IV., 180 *seqq.* When an old man, Rodriguez in 1574 returned to Portugal and died in Lisbon in 1579.

⁴ POLANCO, II., 175, 503. TACCHI VENTURI, 267 *seqq.*

for seven and eight, and indeed for thirty or forty years.¹ However much the neglect of religion may be attributed to the consequences of the almost incessant feuds and wars which ravaged Italy, the state of affairs was undoubtedly in part an inheritance from the Renaissance period, in which not a few bishops and Popes neglected their duties in the most reprehensible manner. The injury to religious worship by neglect was especially noticeable in the most remote parts of the peninsula. The ignorance in the Abruzzi, in Calabria and in Apulia was still so great in the period between 1561 and 1570, that the Jesuit missionaries named those districts the “ Italian Indies.”² The people, were, however, by no means inimical to religion ; whenever worthy priests took them in hand, they flocked to them and were easily led to adopt an exemplary Christian mode of life. Landini writes in 1551, from the district round Modena, that he could clearly see the moral improvement which had taken place since his first visit ; the people now came to hear sermons, even on week days, who formerly did not understand even what the ringing of the bells meant ; no one left the church before he did, and some went to other places in order to hear sermons there ; the people would not let him go until he had promised to come back, and they would come to meet him when he approached a place, while the priests from distant neighbourhoods would beg him to visit their parishes.³

Conditions in the island of Corsica were particularly bad, and, at the request of the Signoria of Genoa, Pope Julius III. on August 5th, 1552, appointed two Jesuit missionaries,

¹ POLANCO, II., 19-20 (Tivoli), 224, 226, 245 (Sicily), 483 (Venice). TACCHI VENTURI, 268 ; BUSCHBELL, 12 (Verona). When, as in Camerino in 1556, a Jesuit summoned anyone to confession, outside Lent, the people at first laughed ; the women were, however, so astonished that people should speak of sermons and of going to the sacraments at such a time, that they almost thought the end of the world had come. POLANCO, VI., 84.

² TACCHI VENTURI, 269-270.

³ Brief of May 16, 1551 : *Epist. Mixtae*, V., 700 ; *cf.* *Epist. quadrimestres*, I., 311.

endowed with full authority for the visitation of churches and monasteries.¹ The reports of these two Papal commissaries, Silvestro Landini and Emmanuel Gomez de Monte Mayor, afford a by no means gratifying picture of religious conditions.² The island was divided into six bishoprics, but for 60 or 70 years none of the said bishops had been seen in Corsica. The priests were so ignorant that, at the beginning of February, 1553, not one of those whom Landini had examined, even knew correctly the formula of consecration for Mass; they went about in secular dress and worked the whole day in the woods in order to gain a living for themselves and their children. The churches were in ruins, and were often used for the shelter of cattle. The people were in the greatest poverty and suffered greatly from the corsairs, while in all religious matters the grossest neglect prevailed. Landini, who, in his missionary journeys in the Modena and Genoa districts in 1551 and 1552, had experienced the most incredible things, writes on February 7th, 1553,³ that he had never seen anything to equal the state of affairs in Corsica; what had been written to him from Rome was, indeed, true, that he would find his Indies and Abyssinia here, for the greatest ignorance prevailed concerning God, the most dreadful superstition, countless feuds, the most bitter hatred, murder in all directions, satanic pride, unceasing immorality, and to all this was added usury, fraud, perfidy and outbursts of ungovernable fury. Some were secretly infected with heresy, many did not know how to make the sign of the cross, and grey-haired men and women could not say the Our Father or the Hail Mary.

In spite of all this it was easy, here as well, to bring the people back to the practice of their religion, and to a change in their morals. The missionaries were besieged by the people from morning till night. The church in Bastia was daily

¹ Extract from the Brief in (DELPLACE), *Synopsis actorum S. Sedis in causa Soc. Iesu*, I., 13; cf. Appendix, Instructions for reform.

² POLANCO, II., 464; III., 80 *seqq.* The letters of Landini and Gomez in the *Epist. Mixtae*, III., 62, 88, 91, &c.

³ *Epist. Mixtae*, III., 114 *seqq.*

thronged at the sermons of Landini, and more than six Franciscans had to assist him daily with the confessions, while there were from 60 to 150 Communions every day. People who had lived for twenty years in enmity were reconciled, and countless cases of concubinage were either dissolved or the parties married.¹ Landini compared the newly inflamed zeal with that of the early church.²

While several bad priests were endeavouring, through calumnies in Rome, to obtain the recall of the Papal commissaries, the members of the senate in Bastia, the governor of the island, and numerous influential Corsicans bore splendid testimony to the Pope and Ignatius of Loyola concerning the activities of the missionaries.³ The mission had, however, to be abandoned in the following year, 1554, because the Corsicans, trusting to help from France, had risen in rebellion against the suzerainty of Genoa, and the whole island was filled with the tumult of war. Landini succumbed there to the effects of his hardships and privations, on March 3rd, 1554;⁴ in Corsica he was venerated as a saint.⁵

The cause of the deplorable state of religious life in the island was, above all, to be found in the ignorance of the priests. It was a quite unheard of thing, even in Italy, that parish priests should preach; many of them never heard confessions, while numbers were hardly able to read.⁶ For this reason Ignatius of Loyola was anxious, above all things, to establish colleges, since religious reform could only be built up on the basis of instruction, and there were no adequate means of providing such. Doménech writes from Palermo on July 4th, 1547, that a Jesuit college was much required there "because such crass ignorance prevails here among the clergy that it would hardly be credible, did one not have it

¹ *Ibid.* III, 114, 168-9.

² *Ibid.* II4, 167, 173.

³ Printed in *Epist. Mixtae*, III., 182-201, 210 *seq.*

⁴ *POLANCO*, IV., 36 *seqq.*

⁵ *Ibid.* Appendix 681 *seqq.*: *Processo intorno alla santità del P. Silv. Landini.*

⁶ *TACCHI VENTURI*, 27 *seqq.*

before one's own eyes. The reason for this is to be found, for the most part, in the fact that there is no opportunity for learning, as here, in the capital of the kingdom, there is not even one public grammar school."¹

Jesuit colleges were, therefore, urgently required. To the missions of the Order in Rome, Tivoli, Padua, Bologna, Messina, and Palermo, which had already been established under Paul III., there were added, apart from the Roman College, during the reign of Julius III., Venice, 1550, Ferrara, Naples, Florence, 1551,² Modena, Parma, Bassano, 1552, Monreale, 1553, Argenta near Ferrara, Genoa, Syracuse, Catania, and Loreto in 1554. In the year of Loyola's death, there also arose colleges in Siena and Camerino. So many new foundations were, naturally, only possible because of the numbers of those who applied for admission into the Order. Julius III. asked, in astonishment, when the candidates destined for the colleges of Florence and Naples were presented to him in 1551: "Will there then be anyone left in Rome?" They were, however, able to reassure the Pope on this point.³

The incentive to the establishment of these institutions were usually the sermons preached by an important member of the Order in a particular city. When the arrangements for the establishment of a college were completed, however, Ignatius did not send any prominent subjects, but merely several young men from the Roman College, as he thought it more advantageous for such a house to begin in a modest way, and then to develop into a flourishing state, than that it should commence with a great brilliancy which it could not afterwards retain.⁴ It was also his principle that every college must be self-sup-

¹ *Litterae quadrimestres*, I., 51.

² Cf. *ibid.* FUETER, Das erste Auftreten der Jesuiten in Florenz; Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte, XXVIII., 432-3, Gotha, 1907. Concerning the protection of the Jesuits by the Duchess of Florence, see TACCHI VENTURI in the *Civiltà Cattolica*, July 16, 1898, and *Arch. stor. Ital.*, Ser. 5, XXII., 217.

³ POLANCO, II., 173.

⁴ *Ibid.* 432.

porting,¹ so that almost all these establishments had at first to contend with great poverty. In Perugia the Jesuits lived for a time only on bread, wine and soup,² and in other places, they were also in very straitened circumstances. In Venice they had to exercise the greatest caution, even before they got as far as the foundation of a college. The Republic suspected political intrigues everywhere, and the very fact of the Jesuits writing to Rome every week awakened suspicion. It was a dangerous thing to hear the confessions of ladies of the aristocracy and to admonish them as to the frequent reception of the Sacraments, a thing for which the Barnabites had shortly before been driven from the city. When the college really was founded, many of the students did not persevere, for the commercial spirit of this centre of trade was not favourable to learning.³ In Messina, people wanted a college, it was true, but they were not provided with the necessary capital; in Modena the Jesuits were reviled as hypocrites and ignorant men;⁴ gradually, however, the new Order struck firm roots, in spite of all difficulties. The instruction of youth was the chief weapon which the Jesuits employed in Italy to fight the incursions of Protestantism.

Looked at from a literary point of view, the reform work of the new Order vindicated itself in all directions, in scientific as in everyday life, with the learned as with the unlearned, even during the lifetime of its founder. Convents of nuns, which had got into a depraved state, were again brought by the Jesuits, by means of the Exercises, into a proper way of life.⁵ Vagrant monks, who often had enlisted among the soldiery,⁶ the Jesuits endeavoured to bring back to their monasteries.⁷ They went to the prisons and galleys to bring spiritual consolation to the neglected prisoners.⁸ Lainez and, later, Nadal, as well as several Capuchins, accompanied, as military chap-

¹ *Ibid.* 507.

² *Ibid.* 438.

³ *Ibid.* 480.

⁴ *Ibid.* 459.

⁵ *Ibid.* 175, 502.

⁶ *Ibid.* 238, n. 164.

⁷ *Ibid.* 29, 461.

⁸ *Ibid.* 37-8 (Palermo), 184 (Florence), 231 (Messina), 425 (Rome), 435 (Perugia), 458 (Modena), 483 (Venice).

lains, the Christian fleets which sailed from Sicily against the corsairs ;¹ Baptista Romanus, a converted Jew, made use of his acquaintance with oriental languages to win over the Mahommedans and renegades on Turkish ships for the Church.² The Jesuits fought against usury,³ collected alms for the poor,⁴ reconciled enemies,⁵ endeavoured to procure refuges for repentant Magdalens,⁶ and were already making attempts to train up Arabic speaking missionaries for the conversion of North Africa.⁷

By far the most thorny field of operations presented itself, however, to the reforming zeal of the young Order, on the other side of the Alps. Nadal, who knew the conditions in the Iberian and Appenine peninsulas from his own experience, went to inspect the German Jesuits as visitor in 1555, and he openly declares that the work in Germany is considerably more difficult and just as glorious as that in the Indies.⁸ "It is an unspeakable misfortune that such a great, powerful and noble nation should be in such a sad state. With the grace of Christ, there is, however, much hope that she may be helped, and I am persuaded that God will do so through our Order, with the authority and favour of the Apostolic See."⁹ "Woe to us" he says in another place, "if we do not help Germany."¹⁰ "There are neither members of religious orders here, nor clergy, nor theologians, so that the Catholic princes and bishops do not know where to begin. Good Catholics have of necessity to put up with married parish priests, public concubinage, and half-Lutheran preachers." One reason for the terrible state of affairs was the fact that there was no

¹ *Ibid.* 45-6, 237-8. GUGLIELMOTTI, Guerra de' pirati, II., 208.

² POLANCO, II., 484, n. 159.

³ *Ibid.* 36, 483.

⁴ *Ibid.* 233, 503.

⁵ *Ibid.* 225, and *passim*.

⁶ *Ibid.* 234.

⁷ *Ibid.* 51-2

⁸ Epist. IV., 214.

⁹ To Ignatius, Dillingen, April 22, 1555.; Epist., I., 298.

¹⁰ *Ibid.* IV., 215-6.

Catholic in Germany who did not read the books of the religious innovators, and that other religious works were not sold at all. "We found all the inns full of the works of Luther and other heretics ; women and children read them, and we were only in districts which call themselves Catholic."¹ There was hardly any Catholic in Germany who wrote in opposition to these books ;² the older Catholic works were no longer published and could hardly be obtained, so that Catholics said they had nothing to read except heretical books.³ Catholic theologians also read these works everywhere, and thus got into a state of theological bewilderment.⁴

This shrewd observer perceived that the cure of these great evils could only be effected, in Germany as elsewhere, by the foundation of colleges. Nadal also pointed out a means for helping Germany, of which there was hardly any mention in other lands, viz. : literary activity. He wished that Lainez might come to Germany and write there against the Lutherans ; he also discussed with the chancellor, Widmannstadt, as to whether, on his application, a printing press might not be established in Vienna, which would daily issue Catholic pamphlets against the Lutherans.⁵

During the lifetime of Loyola, however, they did not succeed in founding any great number of colleges in Germany. The German princes did not understand why establishments for religious orders should be founded, seeing that it was not monasteries, but bishops and parish priests that were required.⁶ Only in 1552 did they manage to found a college in Vienna ; by the year 1555, this already numbered 400 students, under 10 professors.⁷ Besides this the city possessed a noviciate

¹ *Ibid.* I., 301-2.

² *Ibid.* 306.

³ *Ibid.* 309.

⁴ *Ibid.* 303.

⁵ *Ibid.* 305, 309.

⁶ *Ibid.* 289 ; POLANCO, II., 262.

⁷ DUHR, *Gesch. der Jesuiten in den Ländern deutscher Zunge*, I., 49, Freiburg, 1907. The introduction of the Jesuits into Trent, planned by Madruzzo, did not succeed ; see *letter of Card. Pole to Madruzzo, dated Rome, February 27, 1553, in the Arch. Trid. caps. LV., n. 25 (Vice-regal Archives, Innsbruck).

and a house of studies in the year of Loyola's death, while three other colleges, in Cologne, Ingolstadt and Prague, arose during the last year of the life of the founder.

The Order owed the college in Cologne, and still more those in Ingolstadt and Prague, to the influence of that man who in the time to come was to be the founder of the German province of the order, and the animating spirit of all their undertakings—Peter Canisius. Cologne, for the Church of the XVIth century a post as important as it was often imperilled, received the Jesuits at first in a manner anything but friendly.¹ It was especially the sermons of Canisius which gradually gained them friends.² "If we could only open a school," writes Leonhard Kessel, the superior of the Jesuits in Cologne, in 1549, "then all the youth, and with them the others, would be won for Christ."³ This wish was fulfilled when the post of director of the "Collegium Tricoronatum" became vacant, owing to the apostacy of its head. The city-council did not wish to give this establishment into the hands of the Jesuits, but the son of their Burgomaster, Johannes Rethius, who had taken their side, induced them to do so. The "Collegium Tricoronatum" developed very rapidly, and became for Germany, very much what the Roman College was for the whole Order, a school to send out workers in all directions.⁴

Canisius had at once been sent, with Salmeron and Le Jay, to Ingolstadt, to give lectures at the university. The new professors, however, had only an audience of fourteen, of whom the greater number possessed neither the necessary preliminary instruction nor any interest in religion or science. Salmeron and Le Jay were therefore soon recalled, but Canisius remained; he attained many successes and gained general esteem by his

¹ BRAUNSBERGER, I., 136, 672-3.

² *Ibid.* 143.

³ To Ignatius, October 4, 1549, in the *Litt. quadrim.*, I., 172. Concerning L. Kessel, whose greatness lay in the care of souls, see TH. VIRNICH in the *Annalen des Histor. Vereins für den Niederrhein*, part 90, Cologne, 1911.

⁴ DUHR, I., 33 *seqq.* Mon. Ign. Ser. I, XI., 200 *seqq.* KLIN-KENBERG, *Das Marzellen-gymnasium*, Cologne, 1911.

private lessons among the students, by his lectures and by his zeal in the care of souls. A college would have been the most important step, in view of the insufficient preliminary training of the students, but the negotiations, begun in 1555, did not advance, and Ignatius, therefore, summoned the Jesuits from Ingolstadt to Vienna. Three years later Canisius was recalled to Bavaria, and the college was opened in the following year.¹

Many Bohemians were in the habit of studying in Ingolstadt. The success of the Jesuits there, as well as in Vienna, awakened the hope in the minds of Bohemian Catholics of being able to procure the theological seminary of which their country stood in need, through the help of the new Order. In the year 1552 they addressed themselves, with this intention, to King Ferdinand I., who assented all the more readily to the proposal, as the state of the Church in Bohemia seemed even more hopeless than in Germany. Catholics, Utraquists, Bohemian Brethren and Lutherans all struggled together for the mastery; there was no bishop in the country, unworthy subjects crept into the priesthood from abroad in all sorts of ways, while the clerical state was despised, many parishes being without priests, which were then seized by Protestant preachers, the University also being in the hands of the Utraquists. Canisius had been negotiating since 1554 about the foundation of a college, to be directed by the Jesuits; two years later it became possible to open one in the convent of St. Clement in Prague.²

While Canisius was pursuing his activities for the colleges of Prague and Ingolstadt, his fixed residence was in Vienna, where the position was so serious that, in the opinion of Nadal,

¹ DUHR, I., 53 *seqq.* BRAUNSBERGER, I., 688 *seqq.* Mon. Ign. Ser. I, X., 535 *seqq.* W. FRIEDENSBURG, Zur ersten Festsetzung der Jesuiten in Bayern, 1548-1549: Archiv für Ref-Gesch, 1912, 85-89.

² A. KROESS, Gesch. der böhm. Provinz der Gesellschaft Jesu, I., 3-36, Vienna, 1910. BRAUNSBERGER, I., 495 *seqq.*, 545 *seqq.*, 762 *seqq.* Mon. Ign. Ser. I, VIII., 78-9; X., 689 *seqq.* Cf. SCHMIDTMAYER in the Mitteil. für die Gesch. der Deutschen in Böhmen, XLIII., 122 *seqq.*

the whole city would have fallen a victim to Lutheranism, had it not been for the efforts of the Jesuits.¹ Canisius took an active part in the work of his brethren; he preached with great success in German and Italian, gave lectures on the Epistle to the Romans, took charge of the prisoners, and visited the parishes in the neighbourhood of the city, which were all without priests.² Ferdinand I. was most desirous, in the years from 1553 to 1556, of having him made Bishop of Vienna, and was earnestly urged thereto by the Papal nuncio, but Canisius absolutely refused this dignity.³ In spite of considerable progress, things remained in a very serious condition in Vienna, and Canisius writes on January 5th, 1554, that he is astonished that it has not come to martyrdom for the Catholics who have remained true to their faith in the city on the Danube.⁴

It was in Vienna that Canisius composed that most important of all his works, his Catechism.⁵ Hitherto there had been no handy abstract of the Catholic religion, suited to the needs of the times; the school teachers, even in Catholic districts, were usually Lutherans,⁶ and Catholic children were taught

¹ Epist. I., 311.

² DUHR, I., 73-4. A. KROESS, *Der sel. Petrus Canisius in Österreich*, 31 *seqq.*, 37 *seqq.*, Vienna, 1898.

³ For the question whether Canisius really carried on, for a time at least, the direction of the bishopric, *cf.* N. PAULUS in the *Zeitschrift für Kath. Theologie*, 1898, 742 *seqq.* A brief of Julius III., of November 3rd, 1554, entrusted him with the management of the bishopric for a year (BRAUNSBERGER, I., 506 *seqq.*); Polanco writes to him on April 2, 1555: "Della administratione del vescovato non se parla più, si che V. R. è libera al tutto." *Mon. Ign. Ser. I*, VIII., 623; *cf. ibid.* 279, 400, 403, the letters of January 15, February 12 and 13, 1555.

⁴ BRAUNSBERGER, I., 443.

⁵ BRAUNSBERGER, *Entstehung und erste Entwicklung der Katechismen des sel. Petrus Canisius*, Freiburg, 1893. BRAUNSBERGER, II., 883 *seqq.* PAULUS in the *Zeitschrift für kath. Theologie*, 1903, 170 *seqq.*

⁶ NADAL, *Epist. I.*, 311.

according to a Lutheran catechism. Ferdinand I. therefore called upon the Vienna Jesuits to draw up a catechism of the Catholic faith. Immediately after his arrival in Vienna in 1552, Canisius was entrusted with this work, and as early as 1554 he was able to lay the first part of his Catechism before the king. It appeared in the following year without the name of the author, but with an Imperial decree at the beginning which prescribed the use of the little book for the schools of the hereditary Austrian dominions. It was intended for teachers and young students, and was therefore written in Latin. As early as 1556 a short extract from the larger catechism appeared at Ingolstadt in Latin and at Dillingen in German. A third catechism, which was intermediate between the two others, was first printed in Cologne in 1558. All these catechisms went through many editions and were extensively translated. They were of the utmost importance in Germany for the work of Catholic reform, as children were taught in accordance with them for hundreds of years.¹

To possess a college in Paris, the centre of theological studies, had very early been the cherished desire of Loyola, but it was precisely in France that the Society of Jesus had to wage a long battle with the officials and prelates of gallican leanings, before winning the right of admission.² It is, however, a fact that they soon gained powerful friends there. Charles de Guise, Cardinal of Lorraine, won over by Ignatius during his residence in Rome in 1550,³ proved himself a real protector. Henry II. was favourable to them in spite of the opposition of his immediate entourage.⁴ No fewer than three Jesuit colleges soon afterwards owed their foundation to the Bishop of Clermont, Guillaume du Prat, among them the very important college of Paris. But the Jesuits had to carry on a more than ten years' struggle concerning the foundation of this Paris college, in the

¹ Cf. JANNSEN-PASTOR, IV., 437 *seqq.*

² H. FOUQUERAY, *Hist. de la Compagnie de Jésus en France*, 195 *seqq.*, Paris, 1910.

³ POLANCO, II., 89-90. *Mon. Ign. Ser. I*, XI., 451; cf. ROMIER, 35-36.

⁴ *Mon. Ign. loc. cit.*

course of which interesting side lights were thrown upon the attitude in influential circles towards the Holy See.

Bishop du Prat had recognized that the raising of the standard of higher education was essential for combating the advance of Lutheranism. He therefore fixed upon a house in Paris, belonging to the bishops of Clermont, for a college, in which professors for the schools of his diocese could receive the necessary scientific training. The only difficulty was the dearth of young men who were inclined to enter. He applied, therefore, to Ignatius, from Trent,¹ in 1546, through Le Jay, and when he had returned to France in the following year, he thought of handing over his house of studies to the Jesuits there as their own property.²

This plan, however, could only be carried out if the new Order were received in France through a royal decree. The king indeed did sign such a document as early as 1550, and again in 1551, at the request of the Cardinal of Lorraine; before this decree could, however, be made legally absolute it had to be examined by the Royal Council, have the chancellor's seal affixed to it, and be registered by the Parliament. The agreement of the gallicanly-inclined Parliament was very hard to obtain, and the difficulties were increased by a misunderstanding on the part of Viola, the superior of the Jesuits. In order to induce the Royal Council to give its approval, Viola had laid before it the Papal decree of October 18th, 1549, by which the privileges of the Society of Jesus were confirmed, and the Council communicated this Papal document to the Parliament. The whole affair thus took on an entirely different aspect. It was no longer a question of allowing the Jesuit colleges into France, but rather a discussion of the privileges of the Jesuits, and in particular of the validity of Papal privileges on French soil.

Special offence was given to the procurator-general of the Parliament, Noel Bruslart, by the Pope's withdrawal of the

¹ Epist. Broeti, Iaii &c., 307-8.

² TOURNIER in the *Études*, XCVIII. (1904), 465 *seqq.*, 622 *seqq.* FOUQUERAY, 150 *seqq.*

new Order from the jurisdiction of the bishops, and his releasing them from the duty of ecclesiastical tithes. Parliament declared, in accordance with the wishes of Bruslart, that the Jesuit Order transgressed the rights of the king, as well as those of Parliament, and also violated the episcopal regulations.¹ The matter remained in this state for a time, and the Papal document was returned to the Jesuits.

It was only at the end of 1552 that Paschasius Broet, a native of France and a student of the University of Paris, who had been appointed provincial for France in the June of that year, took some further steps. He succeeded, by means of a royal command of January 10th, 1553, which instructed the Parliament to register the former mandate in favour of the Jesuits. The opposition of the Paris jurists was, however, by no means yet overcome; on January 16th the advocate-general, Séguier, demanded that representations should be made to the king, and on February 8th the resolution was adopted that, before the proceedings went any further, the royal patent and the Papal Bull must be delivered to the Bishop of Paris, Eustache du Bellay, and the theological faculty for examination.

Eustache du Bellay was a gallican; he did not regard the Jesuit Order as legally established, and had refused to its members the right to hear confessions and the permission to preach, because they were not subject to his jurisdiction. They could therefore only carry on their priestly duties in the Benedictine abbey of St. Germain-des-Prés, which was not subject to the diocese of Paris, or work in the neighbouring diocese of Soissons. The jurisdiction over the Jesuits which he had always claimed now seemed assured to him, when Parliament assigned to him the decision concerning them; naturally, it was not to be expected that he would decide against himself, by acknowledging the Papal privileges of the Jesuits.

When Broet presented himself before the bishop, in order to deliver the Papal Bull to him, du Bellay declared quite

¹ *Ibid.* 197, 199.

plainly that there were already too many Orders even without the Jesuits. Upon the reply that the Pope and the king had confirmed the Society of Jesus, the bishop answered that the Pope could give no confirmation for France, and the king just as little, since it was a matter of ecclesiastical jurisdiction.¹ His judgment was therefore unfavourable. The very name, "Society of Jesus," he declared to be arrogant.² The Jesuits, by their vow of poverty, injured the mendicant orders, and the parish priests by their preaching and hearing confessions, while many of their privileges encroached on the rights of the bishops, of the Pope, and of the universities. As they professed to be desirous of working for the conversion of the Turks and unbelievers, they were at liberty to erect houses at the confines of Christianity ; it was a long way from Paris to Constantinople.

The theological faculty proved no less unfriendly. They first of all sought to delay matters, but finally the dean declared to the provincial, Broet, that the Jesuits would not be successful, that their privileges had not been confirmed by "the Church, that is to say, a Council," and that the Pope could confer no prerogatives to the detriment of bishops and parish priests.³

When, on August 3rd, 1554, the Parliament pressed for an answer concerning the question of the Jesuits, twenty theologians examined the Papal Bulls daily, until a decision was arrived at on December 1st, 1554. This amounts to a complete condemnation.⁴ The very name of the new Society is offensive, according to this document ; it is deserving of censure, because it receives everyone without distinction. All deviations from the older Orders in the constitutions of the Society are held to be blameworthy, and the accusation is

¹ Broet to Ignatius on March 4, 1553 : Epist. Broeti, &c., 87.

² DU PLESSIS D'ARGENTRÉ, *Collectio iudiciorum*, II., 194. FOUQUERAY, 206.

³ Broet to Ignatius on March August 9, 1553 : Epist. Broeti, &c., 94.

⁴ In DU PLESSIS D'ARGENTRÉ, II., 194, and (without the introduction) in POLANCO, IV., 328.

again made that their privileges are contrary to the rights of ecclesiastical and secular personages. Finally and comprehensively, the Society of Jesus is declared to be dangerous to the Faith, disturbing to the peace of the Church, destructive to the religious Orders, and to pull down more than it builds up. This condemnation of a Papal document is prefixed by an introduction, in which the doctors express their "deep veneration for the Holy See."

That such an august and learned body should express itself in this manner, naturally occasioned the greatest excitement against the new Order; sermons against the Jesuits were heard in the pulpits, and placards against them were affixed to the walls. On May 27th, 1555, the bishop forbade them the exercise of their priestly functions, under pain of excommunication, until the Bull should be confirmed by him, the faculty and the Parliament. Broet submitted, although the excommunication would have been invalid, but he appealed to the Holy See.¹

The founder of the Order remained quite unmoved by the general excitement caused among the Jesuits by the Paris decree. When the most esteemed Roman fathers represented to him that the decree should be contested in writing, and the false accusation denied, he replied with perfect composure that this was not necessary, nor would he allow any direct steps to be taken against the distinguished faculty later on. The Society of Jesus, he said, would last for a long time yet, and the University of Paris likewise, and he did not therefore think it advisable that opposition should be further increased and perpetuated by a direct reply.² His plan was to obtain testimonials from ecclesiastical and secular princes, as well as from universities in all districts where the Jesuits were in active work, and to lay these before the Pope, of whose authority there was question in this matter, and then quietly wait to see which would be the mightier, the Paris decree or the

¹ Epist. Broeti &c., 102.

² Mon. Ign., Ser. 4, I., 216 (Gonçalves for February 17, 1555) 375-6, 426.

judgment of the whole world. These testimonials were given in great numbers by the most distinguished persons ; among others by the Portuguese king, John III., the Viceroy of Sicily, the Duchesses of Tuscany and Ferrara, by many bishops, by the Universities of Ferrara, Valladolid, Coimbra and Louvain, and by the Inquisitors at Ferrara, Florence, Evora and Saragossa.¹

It was not, however, necessary to make use of these documents. When the Cardinal of Lorraine came to Rome, at the conclusion of the political alliance with Paul IV., in 1555, there were four Paris doctors in his retinue, among whom was the composer of the decree of December 1st, 1554. A calm discussion between these doctors and four of the most learned Jesuits was arranged, under the presidency of the Cardinal of Lorraine, the result of which was that the Cardinal decided in favour of the Jesuits, and the doctors acknowledged their mistake. A short written refutation of the decree, drawn up by the Jesuit, Olave, who was himself a doctor of the Paris faculty, strengthened the effect of the Roman pronouncement. The decree of December 1st was soon forgotten, even though it was never formally revoked.

During the lifetime of Loyola, the order only obtained one college in France, at Billom, in 1556.² This town was, even in secular matters, under the jurisdiction of the Bishop of Clermont, and the latter endowed the college from his own private means. Royal recognition was, therefore, in this case, not necessary.³

Similar difficulties to those in France were also met with by the Jesuits at the introduction of the Order into the Netherlands.⁴ There as well no college could be opened as long as the Society of Jesus had not been sanctioned by the govern-

¹ Printed in the *Acta Sanctorum Iulii*, tom. VII., *Einleitung zum Leben des hl. Ignatius*, 47, 48.

² FOUQUERAY, 175 *seqq.* *Mon. Ign.*, Ser. I, XI., 366.

³ *Epist. Mixtae*, V., 725. *Epist. Broeti &c.*, 184.

⁴ (DELPLACE), *L'établissement de la Compagnie de Jésus dans les Pays -Bas*, Brussels, 1886. ASTRAIN, II., 366 *seqq.*

ment, and it proved extremely difficult to obtain this sanction. Charles V. was prejudiced against the new Order, and when the Emperor had gone to Spain, the opposition of the two most influential men in the country, Granvelle and Viglius van Zwichem, had still to be reckoned with. Van Zwichem raised great difficulties ; he was specially of opinion that the privileges of the Jesuits could not be reconciled with the rights of the bishops and parish priests.¹

Ignatius, however, did not despair. At the end of 1555 he sent the still youthful Ribadeneira to the Netherlands, who attracted attention in Louvain and Brussels by his Latin sermons, winning the favour of powerful members of the court, especially of the Count of Feria, and obtained in February, 1556, through their mediation, an audience with Philip II., who received him in a friendly manner. He had been carrying on negotiations since June, especially with Ruiz Gomez de Silva, whose influence in favour of the Jesuits was of the utmost importance, and what remained to be done was achieved by means of letters of recommendation from the Infanta Juana of Spain, and from Francis Borgia to Queen Maria of Hungary, who spent some time in Brussels in July, 1556. On August 20th, 1556, Philip II., regardless of the opposition of the president of the Council, Viglius, issued the decree by which the Society of Jesus received civic rights in Belgium.²

¹ *Cartas de S. Ignacio, VI., 573 seqq.*

² *Ibid. 575 seqq. ; cf. CAUCHIE in the Bullet. de la Comm. Roy. d'hist., Ser. 5, II., 160 (1892).*

CHAPTER VIII.

ACTIVITY OF THE ROMAN INQUISITION IN ITALY.—SPREAD OF HERESY IN GERMANY, POLAND AND FRANCE.

IN his struggle against the Protestant movement which threatened the unity of the faith in Italy, Julius III. followed in the footsteps of his predecessor. One of the first acts of his reign was the confirmation of the Roman Inquisition, recently founded by the Farnese Pope. On February 27th, 1550, he appointed six Cardinals as members of this tribunal: de Cupis, Carafa, Sfondrato, Morone, Crescenzi and Pole. Their first duty was to decide on an answer, which had been asked for by the nuncio, Prospero Santa Croce, then at the court of King Ferdinand I., with regard to the matter of the Bohemian Utraquists.¹ It is, therefore, evident, and this is confirmed by other documents, that the Roman Inquisition was to be considered as a central court for all the countries of Christendom, although its principal sphere of activity was in Italy, where, now as always, countless false doctrines were continually making their appearance. Besides Modena and Ferrara, the dominions of the Republic of Venice were in special danger.² Julius III., in the year 1550, carried on an

¹ See MASSARELLI 157.

² See the briefs in RAYNALDUS, 1550, n. 37-38, 57, and FONTANA, 411, 418, 419, 420 *seqq.* Cf. TACCHI VENTURI, I., 306, 329, 330. COMBA gives a list of those accused by the Venetian Inquisition from 1541 to 1600, in the Riv. Crist., III. and IV. Concerning the Anabaptists in the Venetian territory see DRUFFEL, II., 15; Theol. Stud. und Krit., 1885, 22, 23; BENRATH, Reform. in Venedig, 78 *seqq.* With regard to Brescia, see the *brief for the suffragan-bishop there, of May 22, 1550. (Arm. 41, t. 56, n. 459. Secret Archives of the Vatican). Cf. BROWN, VI., 3, App. n. 122.

active correspondence with the nuncio, Beccadelli, concerning this matter. The Signoria was not remiss in taking measures against the heretics, among whom were many Anabaptists;¹ the agreement between Rome and Venice was, however, seriously interfered with when the Council of Ten resolved, in November, 1550, that a representative of the secular authority should always be present at the final judgment of a heretic. The Pope saw in this a threat to ecclesiastical liberty, and a transgression of the old canons, and expressed his disapproval of the decision to the Venetian ambassador, as well as to the nuncio.²

As such a procedure was often followed, Julius III. issued a Bull for the protection of ecclesiastical rights against the encroachment of the secular power. He laid the document before the Roman Inquisition, whose sanction it first received in a sitting of December 30th, 1550, and again on January 2nd, 1551.³ The Bull was published on March 27th, 1551; it expressly laid down, under the threat of excommunication, that no one except the persons authorized by the Roman Inquisition should occupy themselves with the proceedings against heretics, by which regulation, however, the rights of the bishops should not be prejudiced.⁴ Thanks to the skill of the nuncio, Beccadelli, the question was settled by an arrangement with the Venetian Republic, which was also sanctioned by Achille de' Grassi, who was expressly sent to Venice by the Pope.⁵

¹ Besides FONTANA, 411 and MASSARELLI, 170, 172, 175, 184, cf. BECCADELLI, I., 96 *seqq.* A complete collection of Beccadelli's *nunciature reports from Venice of the years 1550-1554 are in the Cod. Vat. 6752 of the Vatican Library.

² See MASSARELLI, 202, 203, 204; cf. BECCADELLI, I., 99-100.

³ See MASSARELLI, 207-8, 209.

⁴ The Bull *Licet a diversis* (Bull. VI., 431 *seq.*, and FONTANA, 416-417) is dated March 18, 1551, but was first published on March 27 (see MASSARELLI, 220). Cf. concerning this document PHILLIPS, VI., 581 *seq.*; HERGENRÖTHER, Staat und Kirche, 607.

⁵ HINSCHIUS, VI., 336, only refers to Sarpi's "Discorso dell' officio dell' inquisitione," 2, 39 *seqq.*, Geneva, 1639, for the agree-

It had often happened, even under Clement VII., that heretical opinions were proclaimed from the pulpit. The Roman Inquisition therefore issued a decree, on May 20th, 1550, according to which all those who expounded the Word of God were bound to preach openly against Lutheran tenets, otherwise they would be regarded with suspicion, and steps taken against them.¹

In the following year the members of the Roman Inquisition took part in deliberations concerning the issue of a Bull by which the system of preaching and hearing confessions should be reformed. In the summer of 1552 they were also engaged in an inquiry against members of the new orders of the Barnabites and Angeliche, who had fallen into a dangerous position, through the over-excited behaviour and arrogance of Paola Antonia Negri. The end of the proceedings, in which Cardinal Carafa had displayed all his energies, was the expulsion of Paola Negri from the order of the Angeliche, the separation of the latter from the Barnabites, and the condemnation of the writings of the late (d. 1534) Fra Battista da Crema, from

ment with Venice; the important communications and reports of Beccadelli (I., 102-104) seem to have escaped his notice, as well as that of DRUFFEL, I., 865. GOTHEIN'S (Ignatius, 526) information is far from complete. Cf. also MASSARELLI, 223. Serristori's *report of April 2, 1550 (State Archives, Florence, proves that the Pope, shortly after his election, made up his mind to take steps against the constant intervention of the laity in Venice; see further BROWN, V., n. 656; cf. *ibid.* 684. Julius III. defines his attitude with regard to this matter in his instructions for Archille de Grassi, dated August 23, 1551 (Casanate Library, Rome, XIV., 38, pp. 97 *seqq.*) printed incorrectly in WEISS, Pap. de Granvelle, III., 579-580, corrections by DRUFFEL, I., 866, and in the Nuntiaturberichte XII., n. 62. The instructions bear the date August 23, not August 27, in the collection of *Istruzioni* (I) in the Doria-Pamphili Archives in Rome, while the copy in Stockholm (Library H., 22) has the wrong date August 27. Concerning the dispatch of the "Magister s.palatii," caused by the appearance of the Anabaptists in Venice, see MUZIO, Lettere, 217 *seq.*

¹ See PASTOR, Dekrete der römisch. Inquisition, 61.

whom Paola Negri and her followers had taken many dangerous views. In order to prevent such abuses for the future, Julius III. appointed, on July 29th, 1552, a friend of Carafa, Cardinal Alvarez de Toledo, who held the same views as the latter, as protector of the Barnabites, and he was authorized to visit both them and the Angeliche.¹ The jurisdiction of the tribunal was considerably extended by a severe edict which Julius III. published on February 1st, 1554, against blasphemers. The Roman Inquisitors were appointed as judges for this crime, and authority was bestowed on them to inflict corporal punishment.²

One of the principal reasons for the spread of Protestant opinions in Italy was the inundation of the country with heretical books.³ The permission to read such books, reserved to the Pope by the Bull *In Coena*, had been very extensively granted since the time of Leo X.; the hoped for advantage of a more effective fight against error had not, however, been gained. The evil consequences which ensued were all the more to be deplored, as such writings were widely read by monks and lay persons, under the pretext that they had the necessary permission for doing so. Carafa had, as early as 1532, demanded the withdrawal of all such permissions in the

¹ Cf. the valuable work of O. PREMOLI, *Fra Battista da Crema secondo documenti inediti*, Rome, 1910, in which, however, the important *brief of Julius III., which I discovered (Appendix No. 16) in the Secret Archives of the Vatican, does not appear. Proceedings were taken, not by the Inquisition, but by the Tribunal of the Governor, against a Roman woman, Fausta Orsi, in 1552 (see BERTOLOTTI in the *Riv. Europ.*, XXIII., 618, 1883). "Fu rimessa in carcere" says Bertolotti, and he continues without giving any further proof "e senza fallo abbruciata come strega confessa." *Ibid.*, 627 seq., concerning another witchcraft case in Rome, in the year 1557.

² Bull., VI., 478 seqq. The *letter of Serristori dated July 3, 1554, shows how Julius III. supported the Inquisition in their proceedings against those who came under this Bull (State Archives, Florence).

³ See TACCHI VENTURI, I., 307 seqq., 313 seqq.

programme for reform addressed to Clement VII.¹ Julius III. carried out these measures, and by a Bull of April 29th, 1550, recalled all those authorizations to read or keep Lutheran or other heretical or suspect books, which had been granted by his predecessors, by Papal legates, by grand penitentiaries or by anyone else. Everybody, no matter what their rank or position, was bound to deliver such works to the Inquisition within sixty days, the sole exception to this regulation being the Inquisitors or the commissaries of the Inquisition, during the term of their office ; measures against disobedience to this order were to be taken by the Inquisitors-General.² The fact that a burning of heretical books took place in Rome, as early as June 3rd, 1550, shows with what expedition this regulation was carried out.³

The Pope who, in spite of his clemency, was repeatedly obliged to take stricter measures against the Jews,⁴ had agreed

¹ See BROMATO, II., 186 ; cf. REUSCH, I., 179 *seq.* Concerning Carafa's programme, see Vol. X. of this work, 310 *seq.*

² The Bull in EYMERICUS, App. 115-6, and FONTANA, 412-13 ; cf. REUSCH, I., 171-2, 180 *seq.* The president of the Council received special authorization on June 4th, 1551 ; see THEINER, I., 482 ; HILGERS, Index, 505.

³ See *Seripandi Comment.* in MERKLE, II., 440. An *edict of the Inquisition against an Italian book, dated August 12, 1553, in the Archives of S. Angelo, caps. II., n. 17 (Papal Secret Archives)

⁴ See Bull, VI., 404 *seqq.*, 484 *seqq.* ; ERLER in the Archiv. für Kirchenrecht, LIII., 43-44 and RIEGER-VOGELSTEIN, II., 145 *seqq.* PIETRO M. LONARDO (Gli Ebrei a Benevento, Benevento, 1889) mentions measures against the Jews in Benevento (May 2, 1550). I also noted in the Min. brev. Arm. 41, t. 58, n. 1034 : *Hier. Gualterutio, December 29, 1550, " Commissio ad inquirendum contra Hebreos," as many Jews are carrying on usury in the States of the Church and forging coins ; *ibid.* t. 60, n. 426. *Legato Romandiole, dated June 3, 1551 : Jews may not ask more interest than in Bologna and Imola ; t. 63, n. 203 : *Seb. Martio, dated March 22, 1552 : against Jews, unbelievers and Portuguese, who practise usury in Ancona, measures will be taken ; t. 64, n. 264 : Marco Spaventio, dated April 25, 1552 : against usury of the Jews in Bologna ; Arm. 42, t. 1, n. 44 : *Bull. pro Hebreis status eccl.,

that the Inquisition should confiscate and burn the Talmudical books in the year 1553. He also authorized an edict of the Inquisition of September 12th, 1553, whereby all the princes, bishops and inquisitors received instructions to do the same thing.¹ The Jews begged the Pope to recall the decree, or at least to allow them the use of the simple rabbinical writings. Thereupon there followed a Bull of May 29th, 1554, ordering the Jewish communities to deliver up all books containing blasphemies and aspersions against Christ, within four months ; no one was to trouble them with regard to other books, which did not contain such blasphemies.² The Inquisition speedily set about the execution of this decree in the States of the Church.³

As regards the activity of the Roman Inquisition against heresy, the latest investigations of the time of Paul III. go far to confirm the expert opinion of Seripando, that the proceedings of this tribunal were conducted in a moderate and clement manner, in keeping with the nature of the Farnese Pope, that severe corporal punishment and executions were of rare

dated February 1, 1555 : removal of the regulation that synagogues must contribute to the maintenance of catechumens in Rome, and order that the treasurer shall pay the latter a yearly sum of 200 ducats. (Secret Archives of the Vatican).

¹ See EYMERICUS, App., 119 ; GRÄTZ, *Gesch. der Juden*, IX., 346 *seq.* ; REUSCH, I., 47 ; ERLER, *loc. cit.*, 44 ; BERLINER, *Zensur hebräischer Bücher*, 3 *seq.*, Frankfurt, 1891 ; RIEGER-VOLGESTEIN, II., 146 *seq.* ; FUMI, 156. Cf. **letter of Sirleto, Rome, September 9, 1553. Cod. Vat. 6177, p. 359 (Vatican Library). Cf. LUZIO, *Pronostico*, 88-89, for the friendly attitude towards the Jews adopted by Cardinal E. Gonzaga.

² Bull, VI., 482-3.

³ Cf. MUZIO, *Lettere Catholiche*, 171 *seqq.*, Venice, 1571 ; GIAXICH, G. Muzio, 53-54, Trieste, 1847 ; REUSCH, I., 47 *seqq.* The mitigation of the decree of May, 1554, mentioned in Reusch, according to GRÄTZ, IX., 359, is contained in the **Bull of December 18, 1554, in Arm. 41, t. 72, p. 718 ; Arm. 42, t. 1, n. 33 : *Universitati Hebreorum, dated January 26, 1555 : *Prorogatio 4 mensium eis statutorum ad corrigendum eorum libros ad alios 4 menses* (Secret Archives of the Vatican).

occurrence, and that many acquittals took place when the contrary had been expected.¹ The same thing is also true of the time of Julius III., as far as an opinion can be formed without the perusal of the inaccessible documents of the Roman Inquisition. It is expressly declared that Cardinal Carafa, who had great influence in matters concerning the Inquisition,² was not pleased with the moderate measures of Julius III.³ The ambassador of Bologna also declares that the Pope had much milder views concerning proceedings against heretics than those held by Cardinal Juan Alvarez de Toledo,⁴ a man whose ideas resembled those of Cardinal Carafa. In the case which the ambassador had in mind, it can be proved that the procedure was in accordance with his statement. The naturalist, Ulisse Aldrovandi, who was sent from Bologna to Rome in 1549, was at once set at liberty,⁵ while others escaped with slight punishment.⁶

At the same time, Julius III. did what his office required from him, for the protection and purification of the faith.⁷

¹ See BUSCHBELL, 220 *seqq.*

² Cf. opinion of Cardinal E. Gonzaga in his *letter to Capilupi, dat. November 4, 1553, in Cod. 6503 of the Court Library, Vienna.

³ See also Vol. XIV. of this work, chap. VII.

⁴ *Letter of Gir. Biagio to Bologna, dat. Rome, June 4, 1550, with regard to the proceedings against Annibale Monterentio. Biagio announces on July 19, 1550, that Monterentio went before the Inquisition himself; although Carafa and Toledo were very much against him. he was mildly treated (State Archives, Bologna).

⁵ See FANTUZZI, *Scritt. Bol.*, I., 167; BATTISTELLA, 119-120; Massarelli in MERKLE, I., 861; BUSCHBELL, 200-201.

⁶ See the *Sententia of January 29, 1551, in App. No. 10 (Vatican Library).

⁷ If GRIMM (Michelangelo, II., 423) means that Julius III., "let Lutherans be Lutherans" he is quite mistaken. Contemporaries judged him otherwise. Andrea del Monte says, in the *manuscript dedicated to Julius III.: "Super insig. montium: Horum temporum haereses iam alias damnatae fragiles sunt et tuo tempore tuis auspiciis infringi coeperunt, quotidie a te franguntur malleis inquisitorum, quos infringendis haeresibus prefecisti" (Cod. Vat. 3561, Vatican Lib.).

He repeatedly took part in person at the sittings of the Roman Inquisition, especially in the early years of his pontificate.¹ The data concerning the members of the tribunal do not allow the membership to be established with certainty. Massarelli counts seven Cardinals as Inquisitors-General in February, 1551, namely Carafa, Carpi, Alvarez de Toledo, Cervini, Crescenzi, Verallo and Pole.² In March of the same year, the Inquisition was engaged on an examination of the bishops, Thomas Planta of Coire, and Vettore Soranzo of Bergamo, who were suspected of heretical views. The investigation ended with an acquittal in both cases.³

¹ See MASSARELLI, 207, 209, 212, 216, 219.

² MASSARELLI, 216. This does not, however, agree with the fact that in the sentence delivered by Carpi on March 4, 1551 (see *Bullet. Senese*, XV., 304-305) the Cardinal describes himself as "unus ex sex per univ. rempubl. christ. haeret. pravit. inquisitoribus." It appears from RAYNALDUS, 1552, n. 57, and FONTANA, Documenti, 423, that the tribunal only counted four members in January, 1552, viz., Carafa, Carpi, Toledo and Cervini. In April, 1553, there were six, viz., Carafa, Toledo, Cervini, Verallo, du Puy and Pighino (see FUMI, 324); in July, August and September of the same year, and in the February of 1554, other names appear, viz., Carafa, Carpi, Toledo, Verallo, Pighino and Puteo (see EYMERICUS, App. 119; FONTANA, 425, 427, and FUMI, 208). Medici only took part in the sittings of the Inquisition temporarily as a substitute for Puteo, who was ill (see MÜLLER, *Konklave*, 235.) In this way the occasional appearance of new names may be explained. Bartol. Serristori *announces on November 4, 1553, that Card. Verallo was seized with illness the day before at the sitting of the Inquisition, so that the session had to be suspended (State Archives, Florence).

³ See MASSARELLI, 219, 223, with a correction p. 892. Cf. the briefs to the Swiss of July 18, (*Archiv. für schweiz. Reform-Gesch.*, II., 27) and October 10, 1551 (see WIRZ, *Bullen*, 360-361). For this matter cf. also MAYER, *Gesch. des Bistums Chur*, II., 100-101. See further in the Secret Archives of the Vatican, Arm. 41, t. 62, n. 895: *brief to the Emperor of October 10, 1551; *ibid.* t. 70, n. 94, the **brief by which Soranzo was given back, dat. February 14, 1554 (t. 71, n., 292 again with the date May 24, 1554). Secret Archives of the Vatican.

Julius III., who had, even as Cardinal,¹ shown himself opposed to personal severity to those who were accused of heresy, granted, by a Bull of April 29th, 1550, absolution to all those who had fallen into heresy, and were only prevented from retractation by fear of the public penance and the shame attached to it, on condition of their presenting themselves privately before the Inquisition, abjuring their errors and performing a secret penance. Those subject to the Spanish and Portuguese Inquisitions, however, and especially the relapsed Jews in those countries, were excluded from this absolution.²

The execution of those who obstinately persevered in their heresy, only took place in Rome in isolated cases under Julius III. The diary of the native of Trastevere, Cola Coleine, mentions on June 6th, 1552, that seven Lutherans were led to S. Maria sopra Minerva, where they abjured their errors. From the same source we learn that on March 21st, 1553, eleven Lutherans, among them the Minorite, Giovanni Buzio from Montalcino, were likewise taken there. On September 4th, 1553, a silk-weaver was executed with Buzio on the Campo de' Fiori, who not only denied Purgatory, the authority of the Pope, and the doctrine of Indulgences, but also declared that Julius III. was Antichrist. According to Coleine, the reconciliation of sixteen Lutherans to the Church again took place before S. Maria sopra Minerva on November 4th.³ If the Pope urged the execution of the relapsed heretic Fanino in Ferrara,⁴ this was more on account of the dangerous state of affairs prevailing there, the palace of the Duchess Renée being known as the "Refuge of the Heretics."⁵

¹ Cf. BUSCHBELL, 202-3, 204, 219, 306-7, 312-3.

² See Bull., VI., 415, *seqq.*; FONTANA, Documenti, 415. Cf. also the Order of the Roman Inquisition of June 10, 1553, in PASTOR, Dekrete, 61.

³ See in App. No. 25 the passages from Cola Coleine (Chigi Library, Rome).

⁴ FONTANA, Documenti, 418; cf. FONTANA, Renata, II., 270, *seqq.*, 275 *seqq.* See also the Zeitschrift für luth. Theol., 83 *seqq.*, 1862; DRUFFEL, Herkules von Ferrara, 36-7; BUSCHBELL, 180-181, 220.

⁵ POLANCO, IV., 67.

The few cases in which heresy was punished by death under Julius III. were described in detail in Germany by means of pamphlets,¹ in order to give the impression in that country that a violent persecution of Italian Protestants was being carried on. What actually took place is best understood from the letter of Vergerio to Bullinger, on October 8th, 1553, concerning the state of affairs in Italy. He says: "People might believe that hundreds were being burned daily, but this is by no means the case; not a single person has been put to death, although in some places heretics are, to a certain extent, persecuted."²

In the Florentine ambassadorial dispatches mention is repeatedly made of heretics being sent from Tuscany to Rome.³ That the same thing was true of Naples can be seen from a letter of the commissary-general of the Roman Inquisition, the Dominican, Michele Ghislieri, to Cardinal Cervini, on August 4th, 1553. Ghislieri, who was specially zealous for the work of the Inquisition, saved in 1551 the gifted

¹ "Dreadful news as to what Julius III. has done to two Christians," trans. by Barth. Wagner, 1551. . . . F. Schwartz. "True report of thre martyrs, killed by the Pope (1551)." "True story of Montalcino, who was martyred in Rome, for his Confession of Faith. 1554. . . ." "A true story of two splendid men, called Fanina of Favencia and Dominico of Basana, who, on account of the Holy Scriptures, were killed and martyred in Italy by the Pope named Julius III." (1554). . . . "A History of how Antichrist in Rome again murdered two Christians in this year 1553," trans. by M. Waldner, Nuremberg, 1554. Concerning the rare lampoon, "Modus ad inquirendum Luteranos" composed in Germany and bearing the name of Rome, 1553, as the fictitious place of publication, see LAUCHERT, 29.

² "Diceret quotidie centum comburi. Et non est ita, ne unus quidem, tametsi levis quaedam persecutio paucis in locis oborta sit" (CALVINI Opera, XIV. [Corp. Ref. XLII], 636). This important testimony has not been sufficiently noticed until now.

³ Cf. Serristori's reports, dat. Rome, January 22, and February 2, 1552. (State Archives, Florence). Concerning certain barefooted friars, who were delivered up from Ravenna and Rimini at the same time, see SLEIDAN, Correspondence, 231, 235.

Minorite, Sisto da Siena, a converted Jew, from the threatened death by fire, reconciled him to the Church, and thus gained a useful champion for the faith.¹ On September 19th, 1554, Ghislieri sent to Cervini a list of sixteen names of Servites, who had preached Lutheran sermons. It is evident, from a pronouncement of the tribunal of the faith in Bologna,² how frequently members of the Servite Order were at that time convicted of heresy. The religious ferment in that town had also taken possession of the youthful students. Proceedings had to be instituted in 1553 against a large number of the students of the Spanish college, some of whom belonged to very distinguished families, on account of their Protestant opinions. The moderate and shrewd manner in which the inquiry was conducted would have been impossible under such a man as Carafa. The benevolent Julius III. succeeded in arranging this painful matter in private.³ Notice of the spread of heresy reached the Roman Inquisition specially from the duchy of Urbino, the diocese of Lucca and the territory of Milan. It was rather difficult to intervene in Milan, as the archbishop repeatedly got into conflict with the Inquisitors.⁴ Added to this there was constantly in this diocese great interference on the part of the secular authorities, which caused the Cardinals of the Roman Inquisition to lay a complaint against the Milanese Senate before the Emperor and the Governor in the August of 1553. During these disputes, Rome was at great pains to prevent the Spanish government from making use of the Inquisition for political purposes.⁵

¹ Cf. CANTÙ, II., 451 *seq.*; TACCHI VENTURI, I., 344; *Bullet. Senese*, XV., 304-5; XVII., 5, 30 *seqq.*

² See BUSCHBELL, 212 *seqq.*, 321, 322; *cf.* TACCHI VENTURI, I., 532.

³ Cf. the thorough investigations of A. BATTISTELLA in the *Atti per le prov. d. Romagna*, XIX., 138 *seqq.* 1901.

⁴ See BUSCHBELL, 213; CARCERERI, *Riforma e Inquisitione nel ducato di Urbino*, Verona 1911; *cf.* FUMI, 210-211.

⁵ See FUMI, 199-200, 201-2, 205-6. Cf. to complete, the two **documents of November 30, 1552, and January 21, 1553 (*Arm.* 39, t. 60, p. 13-14, 30-31. Secret Archives of the Vatican).

The territory of Milan was all the more threatened by the innovators because of its proximity to Switzerland, but the Catholics in that country also rose successfully against them, an undertaking which Julius III. supported, as far as possible, through his nuncios.¹

Most disquieting news from Naples, which under Paul III. had been a rallying point of the innovators,² had repeatedly reached Cervini. Great excitement had been specially caused when, in 1551, a grand-nephew of Cardinal Carafa, the Marquis of Vico, Galeazzo Caracciolo, fled to Geneva and became the intimate friend and supporter of Calvin.³ In order to provide the Neapolitan district with vigorous assistance, a delegate of the Roman Inquisition was installed there in the year 1553.⁴

¹ Concerning Paolo Odescalchi, who was sent to Switzerland in July, 1553, see, besides HUBERT, Vergerio, 133, 288, WIRZ, Bullen, 361-2. The *brief of July 17, 1554, is missing here; it was addressed to the seven Catholic Cantons, and contained the admonition to support the Bishop of Chur in warding off the Lutherans and other heretics, who were continually coming to Switzerland from Italy and elsewhere (Min. Brev. Arm., 41, t. 71, n. 426. Secret Archives of the Vatican). Ottaviano Raverta (Rovere), Bishop of Terracina, arrived in Switzerland in the autumn as the Pope's ambassador. He supported the Catholic Cantons in their proceedings against the innovators in Locarno, where the Protestant service was forbidden, and those who did not obey were driven out on May 3, 1555. See MEYER, Die evang. Gemeinde in Locarno (their emigration to Zurich, and their subsequent fate), Zurich, 1836. DIERAUER, Gesch. der schweiz. Eidgenossenschaft, III., 300-301; RHEINHARDT-STEFFENS, VII.-VIII.

² See Vol. XII. of this work, 495 *seqq.* In 1554 Julius III. ordered that the property of the heretics in Naples should not be confiscated in future; see AMABILE, I., 219; HINSCHIUS, VI., 333.

³ See KAMPSCHULTE-GÖTZ, Calvin, II., 247, Leipsic, 1899.

⁴ Cf. LEA, The Inquisition in the Spanish dependencies, New York, 1908. Moronessa mentions the activity of Pacheco and Rebiba against heresy in the Neapolitan district, in LAUCHERT, 638, n. 2. Concerning the interposition of A. Caro in Benevento, see Studi stor., XVII., 532, XVIII., 490.

Concerning the proceedings instituted against the Neapolitan, Matteo da Aversa, Ghislieri writes from Rome to Cardinal Cervini on August 4th, 1553: "The accused had undergone the torture of the scavenger's daughter, but remained firm; it was only after three or four days that he was brought to acknowledge many errors, as for example, that he had found it impossible to believe that Christ was God."¹ Cardinal Pole would not consent to the employment of this frightful measure in the case of Aversa. In a conversation with Carafa, the English Cardinal told him that although he approved of the object, he repudiated such means of attaining it.²

The Jesuits, who were, in principle, in agreement with the inquisition, chiefly made use of peaceable instruction as a means of converting heretics. It was reported from many places that they had succeeded in reconciling many to the Church, even when they had gone so far, as several did in Venice, as to deny the immortality of the soul. In Ferrara, the Jesuit, Pelletier, united his efforts with those of the King of France and the Duke, Ercole, to obtain the conversion of the Duchess Renée. She confessed with many tears to Pelletier and received Holy Communion from his hands in 1554;³ it is, however, true that she afterwards relapsed into heresy.⁴

Besides peaceable persuasion the Jesuits principally sought to counter the Protestant invasion of Italy by the instruction of the young. This they did in Genoa⁵ and Naples. In the latter city, the followers of Juan Valdes instigated a violent persecution against them in the year 1552. This did not prevent Salmeron from preaching against the reformers in the following year, with such success that very many were con-

¹ BUSCHBELL, 214-5, 319-20.

² See BECCADELLI, II., 351.

³ Cf. POLANCO, II., 205, 217, 451, 481; III., 149; IV., 77. Pelletier's letter to Ignatius, dat. Ferrara, September 24, in the Epist. Mixtae, IV., 360 *seqq.*; cf. *ibid.*, 390, 429. How reserved, and even disapproving, Nadal's attitude is, is seen in POLANCO, II., 35.

⁴ See HERZOG, Realenzyklopädie, XVI., 659-60.

⁵ Cf. ROSI, La Riforma religiosa in Liguria, 52-53, Genoa, 1894.

verted.¹ The measures employed by the reformers to frustrate the activity of the Jesuits is evidenced by a characteristic case of which we learn in Rome. A Calabrian, 33 years of age, was sent by them to the Jesuits so that he might spy out their pursuits, as a novice, and attempt to seduce some of them. His outward life was blameless, and he confessed and communicated frequently. When, however, it became evident that he held heretical views, he was dismissed, but on leaving the noviciate he was arrested by the Inquisition. As he proved to be repentant, he got off with being condemned to the galleys.²

Very often quite innocent persons were accused of heresy. This fate overtook, not only the above-mentioned Bishop of Bergamo, but other prelates as well. Even a Cardinal, and such a distinguished personage as Morone, came under suspicion. A certain Frate Bernardo of Viterbo, who had been brought before the Inquisition, called his orthodoxy in question. Perhaps it might have gone as far as the arrest of Morone by the Roman tribunal, if Julius III. had not informed the Cardinal, and afforded him the opportunity of at once justifying himself, whereupon the Frate retracted the unjust allegations he had brought against him.³ The defence of the suspected Archbishop of Otranto, Pietro Antonio de Capua, and of the

¹ See TACCHI-VENTURI, I., 326-7. A *brief for the Neapolitan Cardinal of July 1, 1552, authorized him to condemn heretics to the punishment of the galleys (Arm. 41, t. 65, n. 451, Secret Archives of the Vatican).

² The case is cited by RULE (Inquisition, II., 192-3, London, 1874), who refers it to ORLANDINI, Hist. Soc. Iesu, P. I., II, 7, 338, Cologne, 1621. Orlandini's source is the work of O. Manareus, first printed in 1886, where the matter is stated on p. 115 *seqq.*; moreover, it was not the case of a Calvinist, as Rule states. Manareus (118) and Orlandini in accordance with him (II, 8) relates that two chests of books were presented to the Roman professed house of the Jesuits from Venice; among them were Catholic books, but they were mostly Protestant works, which Ignatius caused to be thrown into the fire. Cf. TACCHI VENTURI, I., 309, n. 3.

³ See Morone's report in CANTÙ, Eretici, II., 181-2; cf. 171.

Patriarch Giovanni Grimani of Venice was not so easy. The Emperor had repeatedly and urgently requested the purple for de Capua, but always in vain, as the inquisition had instituted an investigation against the archbishop, on a charge of heterodoxy. Even though the accused succeeded in proving himself innocent,¹ the dignity of the cardinalate was not conferred on him. The absolute want of foundation for the accusation against the Patriarch Grimani was shown in a similar manner, but although nothing could be proved against him but a few imprudences, the red hat was refused to him as well, in spite of urgent requests from the Republic of St. Mark. The scandal and shame of having been brought before the Inquisition for examination was so great that Julius III. assured the Venetian ambassador that all the waters of the Tiber could not wash it away.²

While Italy succeeded in warding off the dangers threatening the Church, the state of affairs in the countries beyond the Alps was steadily growing more gloomy. The issue in Germany was no longer doubtful, since the revolt of the Elector Maurice of Saxony and his fellow conspirators had been successful and the treaty of Passau had confirmed it (August 15th, 1552). Neither the Pope nor the Emperor was in a position to give a different turn to affairs. Julius III. resolved, with a view to

¹ See in Appendix No. 22 the *brief of May 31, 1554 (Secret Archives of the Vatican).

² Cf. besides DRUFFEL, III., 253-4, *Corpo Dipl. Port.*, VII., 272, 306; DE LEVA, G. Grimani; *Atti d. Instit. Veneto*, Ser. 5, VII. (1880-1881); DE LEVA, *Su due lettere del card. di Trani*; *ibid.*; CARCERERI, G. Grimani, 8-9, Rome, 1907; BUSCHBELL, 47 *seqq.*, 116 *seqq.* Card. Farnese referred later to the case of Grimani in the lawsuit of the Carafa family (see *Proc. Carafa, t. LVI., 96, in the Arch. crim. of the State Archives, Rome). It was also merely a matter of thoughtless utterances in the case of the Augustinian hermit Aurelius Novocomensis; see the *letter to the Lombardic Congregation, dat. April 5, 1550, in the *Regesta H. Seripandi, XXIII., 181; *ibid.* 182b the *Formula abiurationis of the said Novocomensis (General Archives of the Augustinians in Rome).

saving what was still possible, and strongly defending his own position, to send to the assistance of the nuncio, Zaccaria Delfino,¹ then at the Court of Ferdinand I., for the Diet convoked at Augsburg, an experienced diplomatist and a shrewd judge of conditions in Germany, in the person of Cardinal Morone. On account of the painful experiences which the representative of the Pope had had at former Diets, there were at first misgivings in Rome, when, in accordance with the wishes of Charles V., it was proposed that a Cardinal-Legate should be allowed to take part in the contemplated discussions concerning religion.² Cardinal Otto von Truchsess alone represented, in a letter addressed directly to His Holiness, the urgent necessity for an able Cardinal-Legate, well acquainted with the state of affairs in Germany.³ Truchsess also repeatedly begged the influential Cardinal Cervini to take steps in Rome to gain this end.⁴ The appointment of Morone as Legate to Ferdinand I. followed on January 7th, 1555; on February 13th, the Pope, who was at that time confined to bed with the gout, gave him the Cross, and five days later Morone left the Eternal City.⁵ His office, as may well be imagined,

¹ Delfino, the successor of Girolamo Martinengo, had arrived in Vienna on February 7, 1554; see PIEPER, 66-67; *ibid.*, 181 *seqq.* his instructions, dated December 1, 1553. The credentials for Delfino in DRUFFEL, IV., 316, dated November 1, are not, as Pieper (67 n) believes, of December 1, but of November 20, 1553. It is also quite wrong when Druffel describes Bishop Delfino as *legatus de latere*, in the above passage. The true state of the case is shown from the text given in Appendix No. 21 (Secret Archives of the Vatican). Delfino received a monthly provision of 150 scudi, the French nuncio twice that sum; see *Intr. et Exit., 1554-1555 in Cod. Vat., 10605 of the Vatican Library.

² Cf. LANZ, III., 610-611; DRUFFEL, IV., 529.

³ **Cardinal d'Augusta [Truchsess] to Julius III., dat. Dillingen, June 26, 1554. Litt. di princ. XIX., 275 (Secret Archives of the Vatican).

⁴ See DRUFFEL, IV., 547.

⁵ Acta consist. in PIEPER, 69, n. 5. FIRMANUS, 505. *Letter of the Bolognese ambassador of February 13, 1555 (State Archives, Bologna). The *passport for Morone, dated February 16, 1555,

was a most difficult one, for, as Delfino states, a considerable number, even of Catholics, were inclined to assent to the dangerous agreement of Passau.¹ Julius III. gave the Cardinal strict injunctions to defend, in a fitting manner, at least the Papal authority during the impending negotiations.² In Morone's company were the Jesuits, James Lainez and Jerome Nadal, to act as his theological advisers.³

For a long time before his departure on this mission, Morone had been co-operating in a work which was to be of the greatest importance for the Catholic regeneration of Germany.

All those who thoroughly understood the conditions in Germany, the bishops as well as the Papal nuncios, had been pointing out for years that the state of religious neglect of the people in the districts which were still Catholic, arose chiefly from the extraordinary scarcity of priests, a thing which had made itself felt still more since the political and ecclesiastical revolution. The Catholic clergy, whom the reformers represented as the source of all evil, and endeavoured to bring into contempt by every means in their power, were threatened with extinction.⁴ No one understood better than Ignatius of

in the Secret Archives of the Vatican, Arm. 44, t. 4, n. 62; *ibid.*, n. 63-71, a number of briefs which relate to this mission, and of which only one is printed in RAYNALDUS, 1555, n. 4.

¹ **Delfino to Card. del Monte, dat. Augsburg, March 9, 1555 (Lett. di princ., XIX., 154. Secret Archives of the Vatican).

² See the *brief of February 16, 1555 (Secret Archives of the Vatican). Cf. RAYNALDUS, 1555, n. 3-4, and in Appendix No. 26, the *letter to Capilupi of February 16, 1555 (Gonzaga Archives, Mantua).

³ See BRAUNSBERGER, I., 521.

⁴ See the numerous testimonies in JANNSEN-PASTOR (VIII., 418 *seqq.*) which could be largely added to. The nuncio Martinengo also repeatedly speaks of the want of priests. See his *letters, dated Vienna, April 22 and May 20, 1551. In that of April 22 he says: "Queste provincie, monsignor mio, quanto a sacerdoti non potrebbon star peggio di quello che stanno. Mi vien detto ch'in alcuna diocesi si trovano ducento benefici curati senza pastori et plebani, et, si qui sunt, o sono infetti d'heresia o vero uxorati o

Loyola that a thorough change must take place, if the Catholic regeneration of Germany was to be taken in hand in an energetic manner. The idea of founding in Rome a training college for secular priests who should distinguish themselves by their piety and learning, and would be capable of acting as spiritual advisers, preachers, professors, and as bishops, and of planting them like leaven in the German dioceses, was maturing in his mind. Such a college could not be founded in Germany itself, for, as Ignatius pointed out in a memorandum intended for Charles V.,¹ not only was heresy openly rampant there, but everything had been so ruined by many pretended Catholics, that their bad example could only have the most injurious effect on the young students. The justice of this consideration was shown by the fate of the college founded by Cardinal Truchsess in Dillingen in the year 1549, for the training of priests. Although Julius III. raised this institution to be a university in 1551,² and the Cardinal devoted the whole of his fortune and income to it, it never realized the expectations of its founder, until it was given into the hands of the Jesuits in the year 1564.³

senza ordini sacri, tal che per questa gran penuria de preti ogni giorno son sollecitato a dispensar confrati, acciò potessero essi non ostante l'apostasia far' questo essercitio, ma non estendendosi tanto oltre le mie facultà, non posse sodisfare alle loro domande, onde o per via del concilio o d'altro hanno estremo bisogno di qualche buona provisione '' (Nunziat. di Germania, 63. Secret Archives of the Vatican). See also Le. Jay's letter in the *Zeitschrift für Kath. Theol.*, XXXII., 612.

¹ Draft in SCHROEDER, 203-4; cf. STEINHUBER, I., 2nd Ed., 12.

² See SPECHT, Universität Dillingen, Freiburg, 1902, 22 *seqq.*, 55 *seqq.*, 60 *seqq.*, 609 *seqq.* By a *brief of April 1, 1550, Julius III. ordered the support of the Dillingen College, by carrying the brief of Paul III. into effect (Arm. 41, t. 55, n. 248). A *brief for Card. Truchsess of January 14, 1555, allows, out of consideration for the Dillingen institution, and the want of priests, the ordination of illegitimate students (Arm. 42, t. 1, n. 14. Secret Archives of the Vatican).

³ See JANSEN-PASTOR, VII., 157.

A further reason which Ignatius had for wishing this training college for German priests to be in Rome lay in the difficulty of finding in Germany the pecuniary support for such an institution, and of providing it with suitable professors. Added to this there was the dislike for the Papacy which was prevalent in Germany, in many cases even among Catholics, which not infrequently degenerated into actual hatred. In order to combat this feeling, the students were to be given an opportunity of convincing themselves, by personal observation, of the "love, benevolence, and the desire to help and to save" of the Holy See, and in this manner to induce people to change their opinions.

The idea of founding such an establishment first took shape in the mind of Cardinal Morone. After he had conferred about the matter with Ignatius of Loyola, the latter placed his Order at the disposal of the Cardinal for this important undertaking. After Morone had communicated his plan to Cardinals Cervini, Carpi and Alvarez de Toledo, he went with Cervini to Julius III., who joyfully gave his consent to the proposal. He said he had already thought of something similar himself, and would be glad to further the design.¹

The first steps were taken as early as 1551, but on account of the unhappy war about Parma and the financial difficulties connected with it, the carrying out of the undertaking was deferred. Ignatius, however, did not lose heart, but continued his preparations full of confidence in Providence. In May, 1552, he drew up a memorandum concerning the manner in which the foundation was to be proceeded with.² Those accepted should as a rule be between 16 and 21, of good disposition, healthy, and not in any way deformed; they should moreover be of average intelligence, capable of forming correct judgments and possessed of agreeable manners. The rudiments of learning and noble birth were desirable, and they should also come from different dioceses. In order to obtain

¹ See POLANCO, II., 421 *seqq.* Cf. Ignatius to the Papal nuncios, 1554, in SCHROEDER, 211.

² SCHROEDER, 9 *seqq.* STEINHUBER I. 2nd Ed., 8.

such students, the Pope was desired to apply to the Emperor and the King of the Romans, as well as to the princes and prelates of the Empire, either directly or through his nuncios. A promise should be given that all the expenses of maintenance for the students would be met, and the youths chosen should clearly be given to understand that they would return to their own country armed with learning and piety, and provided with ecclesiastical benefices. In order that a beginning should be made at once with the college, the Cardinals were begged to decide as soon as possible the sums they intended to provide, and to give their donation without loss of time, as the expenses would be twice as great in the first year as later on. For the present the establishment could be started in a hired house; this, however, should be as near to the Roman College as possible, as the students were to attend the lectures there.

In July, 1552, Julius III. took the final steps for the foundation of the "Germanicum," by appointing six Cardinals: Morone, Cervini, Alvarez de Toledo, Carpi, Truchsess and de Puy, as protectors of the institution. In accordance with the scheme which Ignatius laid before them, a Bull was drawn up on August 31st, 1552, by which the new college was founded and placed in the hands of the Society of Jesus.¹ Ignatius had already written² to the Jesuits in Vienna and Cologne, in order that they might send students for the German College. The opening took place in October, and by December, twenty-four students were already in residence, which number was increased to about sixty two years later.³ Ignatius composed the regulations for the establishment, and the rules for the students, just as he had drawn up the draft for the Bull of foundation.⁴ His wise constitutions, which the Saint, in the absence of older models, had to draft almost from the beginning, are "in their pregnant brevity, decision and moderation, a master-

¹ The Bull dat. August 31, 1552, but first published in 1553 in SCHROEDER, 40 *seqq.*; first draft *ibid.* 30, 31.

² On July 30 and 31, 1552, in SCHROEDER, 20 *seqq.*

³ *Ibid.*, 197.

⁴ The constitutions in their first and second drafts in SCHROEDER, 51 *seqq.*, 195 *seqq.*; the Rules *ibid.*, 93 *seqq.*

piece, which has served as a model for countless seminaries.”¹

Concerning the progress of the students in learning and their moral development, letters from Roman Jesuits of the year 1554 express themselves in very favourable terms ; on the other hand, Ignatius had much trouble and labour through the want of sufficient means for their maintenance. According to the original idea, the Jesuit Order was to have nothing to do with the financial affairs of the college, but circumstances forced Ignatius to take this burden as well on his shoulders. The question of funds repeatedly occurs in his memorandum concerning the college, for there lay the greatest danger lest the whole undertaking should suffer shipwreck. In the September of 1552, he made a proposal that, first the Cardinals, and then the prelates and secular princes should be applied to for voluntary contributions, and that annual payments should be asked for from the rich orders, abbeys and benefices.² Thereupon an appeal for donations was circulated among the fifty-eight Cardinals at the beginning of December ; the Pope himself entered his name for 500 ducats yearly, and thirty-three Cardinals for larger or smaller sums, so that an annual income of 3565 ducats seemed to be assured for the time being.³ This source of revenue, however, being dependent on the good-will of the donors, was, of necessity, somewhat uncertain, besides which, it was only sufficient for a very limited number of students, while Ignatius would have gladly seen these increased to 200 or 300 ; for this, however, a yearly income of from 8000 to 9000 ducats would be necessary.⁴ The financial

¹ STEINHUBER, I., 2nd Ed., 20 ; *cf.* 61. “ The Collegium Germanicum in Rome, the foundation of which St. Ignatius carried out with such tenacious energy, was the ideal model for the seminary of the decree (of the Council of Trent). By its wise statutes, which the Saint himself drew up for his Institute, he has become the Augustine of modern times.” M. SIEBENGARTNER, *Schriften und Einrichtungen zur Bildung der Geistlichen*, 86. Freiburg, 1902.

² SCHROEDER, 36-37.

³ *Ibid.*, 131-132. STEINHUBER, I., 2nd Ed., 10-11.

⁴ SCHROEDER, 207.

position of the Curia made it impossible to grant a fixed, assured, annual income to the college for all time, instead of the vountary contributions now bestowed. Ignatius, however, did not despair. He was determined to keep true to his purpose, the importance of which was fully recognised by Julius III.,¹ who, in January, 1554, pointed out to the Emperor, through his nuncio, the importance of the new college, and requested him to support it.

An all important part in the spread of religious dissension in Germany had been taken by Henry II. of France, when he supported the Protestant princes in their revolt against Charles V. This alliance, however, did not in the least prevent the king from proceeding with fire and sword against the propagators of the new doctrines in his own kingdom, when he saw in them rebels against his royal authority and the laws of the realm, and disturbers of internal peace and national unity. The Edict of Chateaubriant of June 27th, 1551, included all the proscriptions already issued against the Protestants, and rendered them more severe in many points. This Edict was published on the same day, September 3rd, 1551, on which Henry II. forbade his subjects to send any money to Rome,² on account of the attitude of Julius III. with regard to the war about Parma. Shortly afterwards, on October 3rd, 1551, the French "Defender of the Faith" concluded his alliance at Lochau with the Protestant princes who were conspiring against Charles V. Before taking the field in their support, he impressed upon the Parliament, on January 12th, 1552, that they should carefully watch over all matters concerning the faith, and see to the eradication of heresy by the exemplary

¹ See LAEMMER, *Zur Kirchengesch.*, 117-8. Gothein, in his work concerning Ignatius of Loyola, deduces, in a perfectly arbitrary manner, a great "revolt" of the whole of the first students of the college, from some remarks contained in a letter of P. Peter Schorich of October 16, 1554. (See *Katholik*, 1899, I., 36 *seqq.*) It is proved by the *Intr. et Exit. in Cod. Vat.* 10605 of the Vatican Library, that Julius III. paid 500 ducats yearly, until his death, for the "*Collegio di Germania.*"

² See SOLDAN, I., 228 *seqq.*; *cf. supra* p. 102.

punishment of the guilty. Proceedings in France were, therefore, conducted strictly in accordance with these directions. In Agen, Troyes, Nîmes, Paris, Toulouse and Rouen the heretics were sent to the stake ; this was above all the case in Lyons, which had become the principal market for the heretical writings smuggled in from Geneva.¹ In 1554, the Pope, through his nuncio, Gualterio, specially requested the king to suppress these publications,² to which the writings of the gallican Charles du Moulin were also added. The relations between Rome and Paris were, and for the present remained, very strained ; the neutral position taken up by Julius III. in political affairs displeased Henry II. and, in addition to this, there were perpetual disputes with regard to the application of the Concordat.

Julius III. had, in this respect, made important concessions to the king in October, 1550, and in March, 1553. These were, however, in spite of repeated explanations on the part of Henry II., by no means observed. As had previously been the case with Santa Croce, so had his successor, Gualterio, over and over again to struggle against the encroachments of the secular power. Henry II. maintained, in this matter, an attitude in keeping with the state of political affairs at the moment ; if the Pope was necessary to him, he made him fair promises, but when conditions altered, he simply broke them.³

¹ SOLDAN, I., 233, *seqq.*

² See Nonciat. de France, I., 25 ; *cf.* ROMIER, 55. That Julius III. also took other steps against heretics in France is proved from the briefs in RAYNALDUS, 1550, n. 35-36 ; 1551, n. 12 ; FONTANA, Documenti, 410 and Renata, II., 527-8. *Cf.* also the *brief to the theological faculty at Angers, dat. August 31, 1554 : Permission to exclude from their midst all " baccalaurei, licentiati et magistri qui in suis concionibus aliove fidelium cetu propositiones hereticas aut scandalosas proposuerint aut defendere nixi fuerint " (Arm. 41, t. 71, n. 513. Secret Archives of the Vatican).

³ See Nonciat. de France, I., LVI., *seqq.* ; *cf.* also THOMAS, III., 235-6. The confirmation of the German Concordat of 1448 by Julius III. in RAYNALDUS, 1554, n. 19. Romier will publish the nunciature reports of the predecessors of Gualterio. See a brief

In Poland, the development of conditions which were very dangerous to the continued existence of the Catholic Church in that country, had first become apparent under Paul III.,¹ but still continued to spread under Julius III. In the summer of 1550 exceedingly grave machinations were brought to light in the Diet at Petrikau. The king would not agree to the demand for the reform of the Church in the sense demanded by the innovators, and he appointed the eminent Bishop of Kulm, Stanislaus Hosius, as his ambassador at Trent. On December 13th, 1550, the spiritual jurisdiction of the bishops was confirmed by a royal decree, and the followers of the new doctrines were deprived of all their dignities and offices.² The danger for the Church was, however, by no means lessened by these measures, for a great part of the nobility had embraced the Protestant doctrines, and the defiant attitude of their adherents is proved by the excesses which they permitted themselves against everything which the Catholics held most holy. In a suburb of Cracow they pulled the crucifix down and threw it in the mud ; in the village of Chrencice the church was robbed of all its ornaments, and even the Sacred Host was

of January 26, 1555, against the attacks of the French governor on ecclesiastical liberty in Corsica, in RAYNALDUS, 1555, n. 7. Encroachments on the part of the secular authorities occurred frequently in Spain, on account of the demoralisation of the clergy there. Julius III. took steps here in the sense "*ne ius ecclesiasticum obsolesceret neve sceleri libere habenae laxarentur*" (see RAYNALDUS, 1551, n. 82 *seqq.*). See also with regard to Milan, SALOMNE, *Mem. degli ambasc. di Milano*, 110 *seqq.*, Milan, 1806. With regard to Genoa, see ROSI, *La morte di J. Bonfadio*, Genoa, 1895. With regard to Venice, see GÖTHEIN, *Ignatius*, 523. Julius III., complained at once concerning such things in the case of the Republic of Lucca ; see the *report of the ambassador at Lucca, dated Rome, July 12, 1550 : "*Nel parlare che fece S.Stà mostro che la dispiacesse che le S.V. mettessero mano in preti senza consenso del vescovo o del suo vicario.*" (State Archives, Lucca).

¹ Cf. Vol. XII., of this work, p. 488 *seqq.*

² See DEMBINSKI, *Beschickung des Tridentinums*, 26 ; EICHORN, I., 119.

thrown into the fire.¹ It was especially to be deplored that at such a dangerous time, only a few of the bishops, such as those of Gnesen and Cracow, fulfilled their duty. The bishops, moreover, took things very easily in preparing for the Council, and it was not until June, 1551, that they deliberated about it in a synod at Petrikau. Hosius, whom Julius III., at the request of the king, had confirmed as Bishop of Ermland,² on May 11th, 1551, took part in this synod; he drew up, at that time, his celebrated Confession of Faith,³ which the members of the synod accepted. Several of the bishops now bestirred themselves, and carried out wholesome reforms in their dioceses. Many, however, forgot only too soon what they had recognized as their duty at the synod, and again lapsed into their former state of indifference.⁴ The funds for the embassy to Trent could only be collected with difficulty; the mission was at last entrusted to Peter Glogowski, who also visited Rome, where he represented the conditions in Poland in such a favourable light to the Pope, that Julius III. was deceived as to the real state of affairs.⁵ How dangerous things really were, came to light in the Diet opened at the end of January, 1552. John Sigismund was openly called upon to sanction the new teaching as to justification, the marriage of priests, and communion under both kinds. The king, however, could not be induced to give way to such revolutionary proposals. In his heart the last of the Jagellons was a sincere Catholic, and faithful in the discharge of his religious duties, but, good-natured as he was, he did not possess the strength of character to offer a determined opposition to these dangerous proposals.⁶

¹ Cf. WOTSCHKE, *Gesch. der Reformation in Polen*, 110, Leipsic, 1911; see also EICHORN, I., 120.

² See Hosii epist., II., xliii., 993; cf. EICHORN, I., 138-9.

³ For this cf. HIPLER in the *Freiburger Kirchenlex.*, VI., 2nd Ed., 297-9; BELLESHEIM, *Besprechung des zweiten Bandes der Epist. Hosii*, in the *Histor-Polit. Bl.*, CX., 262-3.

⁴ See EICHORN, I., 121 *seqq.*

⁵ See RAYNALDUS, 1553, n. 53-5; DEMBINSKI, 29, 65.

⁶ A good description of the religious attitude of John Sigismund is to be found in the **Relatione del regno di Polonia del vescovo*

In the matter of the Council, he allowed himself to be influenced by his hesitating, visionary secretary, Modrzewski, who had the idea of a free council in his mind. The resolute Catholic, Hosius, was passed over, and men appointed to proceed to Trent, who were as compliant as they were uncertain in their views.¹

In Rome, it was soon realized that Glogowski had reported much too favourably. On September 20th, 1552, the Pope addressed a letter to the inquisitor at Cracow, telling him to make investigations concerning the suspicious proceedings of several Polish bishops with regard to heresy.² When King John Sigismund remarried in the year 1553, the Pope made use of his letter of congratulation to point out to him earnestly that the king should, by his authority, protect the Catholic Faith against abuse and attack.³ Similar exhortations were addressed, some time afterwards, to the bishops and the

di Camerino (Camillo Mentuato ; see CIAMPI, I., 169, 359) in the Cod. R., I., 26 of the Chigi Library, Rome, which RANKE used (II., 6), but put erroneously "about 1555," although he could have seen the correct year in RAYNALDUS, 1551, n. 73. This says : "A molti di questi (in the king's entourage) comporta che vivano come li piace, perche si vede che S.M.^{ta} è tanto benigna che non vorria mai far cosa che dispiacesse ad alcuno et io vorrei che nelle cose della religione fosse un poco più severa, poichè ogni anno esso si confessa, ogni giorno va alla messa et ogni festa ode la predica, l'introito, la gloria, il credo, benedictus et agnus Dei canta a tutta voce con li cantori, così ci tirasse gli altri, che gli sarebbe facile, sebene alcuni dicono il contrario." Serristori announces the appointment of Mentuato, as nuncio in Poland in the *letter of April 6, 1551 (State Archives, Florence). In accordance with this letter, BIAUDET (nonciat. 95), who is otherwise so exact, must be rectified.

¹ See DEMBINSKI, *Beschickung*, 31 *seqq.*, 35 *seqq.* ; cf. KRASINSKI, 86 *seqq.*

² *Min. Brev. 1552, Arm. 41, t. 65, n. 616 (Secret Archives of the Vatican). The suspicion against the Bishop of Gnesen was unfounded ; the Bishop of Chelm, however, J. Uchanski, was justly suspected of heterodoxy : see EICHORN, I., 205-6.

³ *Regi Poloniae, dat. 1553, May 22 (Min. Brev. Arm., 41, t. 68, n. 373. Secret Archives of the Vatican).

Polish nobility, as well as once more to the king and queen.¹ The latter did not justify the hopes² which the Catholics of Poland had placed in her,³ and her husband, now as before, let matters take their course, although Hosius never wearied in urgently recommending the protection of the Catholic religion, by work of mouth as well as by letter. If the king allowed the Church to be torn to pieces, Hosius prophesied to him on March 12th, 1554, then God would also allow his kingdom to go to pieces.⁴ The want of zeal of the greater number of the bishops is shown by the fact that, at the synod at Petrikau, in 1554, besides the Primate of Gnesen and Hosius, only the Bishops of Cracow and Plozk appeared. There was nothing to be done but arrange for a new synod. The Pope was requested to send a nuncio to this, in the person of Lippomano.⁵ The appointment of Lippomano, on January 13th, 1555, was one of the last official acts in the pontificate of Julius III.⁶

¹ The letters to the bishops and nobles in RAYNALDUS, 1553, n. 40, 41, Cf. the *letter to the bishops dated May 27, 1553. Min. Brev. *loc. cit.*, n. 371; *ibid.*, n. 393 to the king, dat. May 27; n. 395 to the Archduchess Katharina on her marriage, dat. May 28 (Secret Archives of the Vatican). Julius III. treated the interests and wishes of Poland with great consideration when the Russian Grand Duke, Ivan the Terrible, attempted to usurp the title of king, by the promise, which was scarcely meant to be sincere, of submitting to Rome in an ecclesiastical sense. Cf. as to this, FIEDLER, in the Sitzungsber. der Wiener Akad., XL., 50-51; PIERLING, Rome et Moscou, 19-20, Paris, 1883; Papes et Tsars, 44-45, Paris, 1890; La Russie, I., 334-5; ÜBERSBERGER, I., 282-3, 287.

² Cf. Martinengo's *letter to Card. del Monte, dat. Vienna, June 1, 1553. Nunziat. di Germania, LXIII., 179 (Secret Archives of the Vatican).

³ Cf. BELLESHEIM in the Histor. polit. BI., CX., 265.

⁴ Hosii epist., II., 411.

⁵ See EICHORN, I., 212.

⁶ THEINER, Mon. Pol., II., 575; cf. EHRENBERG, 69, n. 2.

CHAPTER IX.

ACCESSION OF QUEEN MARY OF ENGLAND.—HER MARRIAGE TO PHILIP OF SPAIN.

AT this time the Church found some compensation for the severe losses which she had sustained in various European states, especially in Germany, by the success which crowned her efforts elsewhere, and, apart from the development of the missions outside Europe, the Catholic Restoration in England must hold the first place among these successes.

During the pontificate of Julius III., England went through two great religious revolutions, in the first of which doctrine and liturgy were subverted in favour of the already far-advanced Protestantism, this period being followed by a complete return to the old religion.¹

Shortly before the death of Paul III., the Protector Somerset, the uncle of the young King Edward VI., was overthrown, and was succeeded by the Earl of Warwick, who became Duke of Northumberland in 1551. This change in the government had, at first, raised hopes in the minds of Catholics that the old religion might be restored, and Mass, as of old, was at once celebrated in various parishes of London and Oxford. The first events of the year 1550, however, soon put an end to these hopes; on January 25th, a decree was issued, according to which the old Latin missals, breviaries, etc., were to be delivered up for destruction, the pictures in the churches being likewise destroyed, except in so far as they represented princes

¹ See H. GAIRDNER, *The English Church*, 262 *seqq.*; J. TRÉSAL, 225 *seqq.*; LINGARD, VII., 16 *seqq.*; *cf.* A. F. POLLARD, *The History of England from the accession of Edward VI. to the death of Elizabeth*, 1547-1603, London, 1910.

and other dignitaries who could not during their lives have been suspected of sanctity.

Other decrees of January, 1550, aimed at the framing of new church laws, and a new formula for the consecration of bishops and other ministers of religion.¹ Many valuable manuscripts shared the fate of the ecclesiastical books, at the end of 1550 whole waggon loads of manuscripts from the Oxford Library being destroyed, of which many had nothing more in common with "Mass-books" than the red capitals of the title page, and of the headings of the chapters. Very many of these were thrown away on hucksters, while shiploads of manuscripts crossed the sea for the use of bookbinders.²

The most decisive innovation, however, was shown in the "Book of Common Prayer,"³ of the year 1552, which was really a remodelling of the original edition authorized by Parliament in 1549.⁴

Somerset had taken great pains, on the death of Henry VIII., to bring the influence of Protestant ideas to bear on the almost completely Catholic state of religion at that time. The introduction of communion under both kinds, the permission for priests to marry, and the use of the vernacular in the services of the church, did not of themselves form an essential ground for a break with Catholic doctrine. A general confession of sin before communion was, it is true, declared to be sufficient in the Book of Common Prayer of 1549, but confession to a priest was also allowed. Alterations, pregnant with fateful results, were now introduced in respect to the Holy Sacrament of the Altar, which, amid a flood of vulgar pub-

¹ GAIRDNER, 276-7. TRÉSAL, 259-260.

² GAIRDNER, 290-291.

³ G. CONSTANT, *La transformation du culte anglicain sous Edouard VI.*; *Révue d'hist. ecclésiastique*, XII., 38-80, 242-270, Louvain, 1911; cf. GASQUET and BISHOP, *Edward VI. and the Book of Common Prayer*. An examination of its origin and early history, London, 1890. BELLESHEIM in *Katholik*, 1891, I., 3-19. BÄUMER in *Histor-Polit. Bl.*, CVIII., 1 *seqq.*, 103 *seq.* Cf. also KAWERAU in the *Histor. Zeitschr.*, LXXII., 140 *seq.*

⁴ Cf. Vol. XII., of this work, p. 476.

lications, now became the central point of the most violent attack and insult. Under Somerset, however, some care was still exercised, the liturgy of the Mass in the first Book of Common Prayer having included many of the outward ceremonies in order that the uneducated might still believe that nothing essential had been altered, while the educated could still infer, from many expressions which still remained, the doctrines of the Catholic Faith.

Quite another spirit, however, pervaded the second Book of Common Prayer of 1552. If the doctrine of Luther had been the standard of the first changes in the liturgy of the Mass in the year 1549, the second compilation was made in the spirit of Zwingli and Calvin. The Book of Common Prayer in its original form did away with everything which caused the Mass to appear as a sacrifice, but the second, on the other hand, removed everything which could form an acknowledgment of the Real Presence of Christ in the sacrament.

The way to this change to the most extreme Protestantism had already been prepared under Somerset. Theologians of the most advanced tendencies found, at that time, a refuge in England, which was denied them everywhere else ;¹ Bucer came to England in April, 1549, from Strasbourg, flying before the Interim, and was at once made professor of theology in Cambridge ; a little time before, the Italian, Peter Martyr Vermigli, who had come to England at the invitation of Cranmer, in 1547, received a professor's chair at Oxford. A visitation of both universities in May, 1549, removed various Catholic professors. Countless abusive publications, introduced from the continent, and allowed to be freely printed in England, prepared public opinion for Calvinistic teaching, while the defenders of the old faith had to publish their answers abroad.² As far as Cranmer himself was concerned he was always receding in his writings further and further from both Catholic and Lutheran doctrines, and, as he himself confessed,

¹ GAIRDNER, 263.

² GAIRDNER, 266, says, " The press in England, too, was free—at least to the enemies of the old beliefs."

had only allowed a few Catholic expressions still to appear in the first compilation of the Book of Common Prayer, in order not to arouse too great excitement among the people.¹

Northumberland was never, as he acknowledged later, at the hour of death, really persuaded of the truth of the Protestant doctrines, but he showed himself, none the less, the zealous friend and the active promoter of the new religion. In order to gain greater freedom for this purpose, the first thing to be done was to remove the Catholic bishops. Bonner, Bishop of London, was the first to be cast into prison, on December 4th, 1549. Bishop Gardiner, of Winchester, had long been in the Tower, and he was deprived of his bishopric on February 14th, 1551, while Heath, of Worcester, was thrown into prison on March 4th, 1550. Day, of Chichester, was declared to have forfeited his see on October 1st, 1551; Tunstall, of Durham, who had been a prisoner in his house since May 20th, 1551, suffered the same fate on October 3rd, 1552. Several other suspected prelates had to resign, while Thirlby, of Westminster, was removed to the unimportant diocese of Norwich.²

Among the bishops who took the places of the deposed prelates, Ridley, of London, was particularly active in promoting the spread of the new doctrines.³ He was inducted into Bonner's see on April 1st, 1550, and on May 5th, he ordered a strict visitation of his diocese, in the course of which everything which was reminiscent of the old idea of the Catholic Mass was specially to be rooted out. Particular instructions were given in this visitation that the altars were to be thrown down in the churches, as the conception of the

¹ CONSTANT, *loc. cit.* 244.

² LINGARD, VII., 60 *seqq.* TRÉSAL, 236 *seqq.* Concerning the deposition of Bonner, GAIRDNER, 269, says, "It would seem that the real object of this irregular and unjust prosecution was simply to deprive a bishop who was so strong an upholder of the still recognized doctrine of transubstantiation. The whole case was prejudiced, &c."

³ GAIRDNER, 278-9. CONSTANT, 246 *seqq.*

Mass as a sacrifice was strongly bound up with the idea of an altar. "So long as there is an altar," preached Hooper, "the ignorant people will always dream of a sacrifice."¹ Ridley himself gave the example of destruction. On the night of June 11th, 1550, he had the high altar removed from St. Paul's in London, and during Whitsun week the same thing was done in all the churches of London. By a royal decree of November 24th, all the bishops were instructed to proceed in a like manner. The work of destruction was completed by the end of 1550. The Venetian ambassador, Barbaro, wrote at the end of May, 1551, that bells and organs were still used, but that they no longer had any altars or pictures.² The altars had been everywhere removed, without consideration for their artistic value or their venerable old age. Scarcely a voice was raised against these revolutionary proceedings, for, although many bishops might feel uneasy in their consciences, their authority had been swept away with that of the Pope.³ The people lost all respect for the desecrated churches, in which dealers bought and sold, bringing in their horses and mules, while bloody conflicts and mortal combats not infrequently took place there. "People are turning the churches," says a royal decree of 1552, "into common inns, or rather into dens and sinks of iniquity."⁴

The introduction of Calvinism into public worship was inaugurated by the destruction of the altars. Apart from this the first Book of Common Prayer of 1549 had really pleased nobody. The people stood aloof from the new services,⁵ while Cranmer himself only regarded the liturgy of 1549 as a temporary measure. Excited by reforming preachers, the young king declared that if the bishops would not alter the Book of

¹ CONSTANT, 247.

² ALBÈRI, Ser. I., II., 247. BROWN, V., n. 703, p. 348.

³ GAIRDNER, 284, "Episcopal authority was well-nigh destroyed already."

⁴ CONSTANT, 249. Concerning the low tone of morality under Edward VI. cf. POCOCK, Eng. Hist. Review, 1895, 417 *seqq.*

⁵ GAIRDNER, 268, 277.

Common Prayer, he would do so himself.¹ Above all, however, the foreign theologians who had sought refuge in England urged more extreme measures. So it came about that a country which was desirous of throwing off the authority of the Pope, on the ground that he was a foreign bishop, actually made over to foreign influence the remodelling of its religion.²

As early as April, 1549, Cranmer, in a meeting with Bucer, Peter Martyr Vermigli, Fagius, Dryander and Tremellius deliberated on the reform of the liturgy.³ Calvin himself wrote in January to King Edward as the new Josias, and exhorted him to extirpate the "great abyss of superstition" which still remained over from the Papal supremacy.⁴ Bucer had the greatest influence in bringing about the new development in public worship, and after his death (February 28th, 1551) the still more advanced Peter Martyr took his place. On March 9th, 1552, the new Book of Common Prayer was laid before the House of Lords, and was accepted by both Houses on April 14th.⁵

The introduction to the new Bill refers to the second edition of the Book of Common Prayer as if it were only an improved edition of the first, but in all essential points identical with it. This is, however, by no means the case. The liturgy of 1549 was an attempt at conciliation, which endeavoured to satisfy Protestants as well as Catholics, as far as was possible; the liturgy of 1552, on the contrary, had the fullest intention of avoiding every expression and every ceremony which the followers of the old religion could construe in accordance with their own views. Nothing of the Catholic Mass remains in the new Order of Communion. Besides this, the second Book of Common Prayer abolishes private Confession and Extreme

¹ *Ibid.* 304.

² *Ibid.*, 291. "Never was greater deference paid to foreign opinion than was now done in a Church which had been emancipated from the jurisdiction of a foreign bishop."

³ CONSTANT, 244.

⁴ *Ibid.* 205.

⁵ *Ibid.* 478.

Unction.¹ As far as the Sacrament of Holy Orders was concerned, they still retained the grades of deacons, priests and bishops, at least in name. One result of the totally altered conception of Holy Communion was the fact that the ordination of priests possessing the real power of consecration was no longer proposed, indeed the very idea of ordaining priests in this Catholic sense was completely excluded.² The new Prayer Book could, therefore, receive the unqualified approbation of the most advanced Protestants. Peter Martyr wrote on June 14th, 1552, to Bullinger that all the traces which might have still nourished superstition were expurgated from it. Bullinger and Calvin, who were begged to give their opinion of it by English refugees in 1554, considered that fault could only be found with it in points of no great importance.³

As in the case of the Book of Common Prayer, the other confession of the faith of the Anglican Church, the Thirty-nine Articles, can also be traced to Cranmer. As early as 1549 he had drawn up a list of tenets which every preacher had to sign before receiving license to preach. There were originally forty-five of these, then forty-two, and finally thirty-nine. King Edward VI. signed forty-two Articles on June 12th, 1553. They formed a mixture of Lutheran, Zwinglian and Calvinistic doctrinal propositions, with a trace of Catholicism running through them, the chief point being the Protestant principle that the Bible is the sole rule of faith. The doctrine of justification was presented in the Lutheran sense, that of communion in that of Calvin. The royal supremacy over the Church was enjoined in the widest sense of the word.⁴

On the 6th of the following month, the fifteen year old king, who had long been an invalid, died, and with his death, the carefully planned work of ecclesiastical revolution seemed as if it would again fall to pieces. It is true that the dying king

¹ *Ibid.* 474-5.

² *Ibid.* 479-80.

³ *Ibid.* 477.

⁴ MÜLLER, *Die Bekenntnisschriften der reformierten Kirche*, 505 *seqq.*, Leipsic, 1903.

had, under the influence of Northumberland, been induced to attempt, by his own power, to alter the succession, and leave the sceptre in safe Protestant hands. In accordance with this arrangement, the sixteen year old Lady Jane Grey, the granddaughter of Henry VIII.'s sister Mary, and the wife of Lord Guildford Dudley, Northumberland's son, was proclaimed queen on July 10th. This alteration in the succession, as it had taken place without the consent of Parliament, was too plainly illegal, and too clearly the result of Northumberland's ambitious intrigues, for the people to give it their approval, and when the rightful heiress to the throne, Henry's eldest daughter Mary, unfolded her royal banner, defenders flocked round her in countless numbers. Northumberland's army went over to her, and on July 19th, Mary was proclaimed queen in London amid the joyful acclamations of her people.¹

Mary, the daughter of Catherine of Aragon,² had not only received a careful and indeed learned education for court life under the direction of Margaret Pole, the mother of the future Cardinal, and who was to die as a martyr in 1541, but also a deeply religious training in a Catholic sense. Her religious feelings were yet more strengthened in the hard school of suffering, through which she had to pass after the repudiation of her mother. Separated from the latter, and assigned to the household of her sister Elizabeth, she received the worst apartments in the house,³ her jewels and costly clothes were taken from her,⁴ the attendants who were faithful to her were

¹ BROSCHE, VI., 415.

² J. M. STONE, *The History of Mary I., Queen of England*, London, 1901. Cf. *ibid.* *The Youth of Mary Tudor*: Dublin Review, Ser. 3, XXII., 363 *seqq.*, 1889; *Mary Queen of England*: *ibid.* XXIII., 324 *seqq.*, 1890; *Philip and Mary*: *ibid.* XXIV., 110 *seqq.*, 1890; *The personal character of Mary Tudor*: *The Month*, XCIV., 128, 1899; ATH. ZIMMERMANN, *Maria die Katholische*, Freiburg, 1890; *Privy expenses of the Princess Mary*, ed. FRED. MADDEN, London, 1831; LINGARD, VII., 2-3. STEPHEN LEE in the *Dictionary of National Biography*, XXXVI., 333-354.

³ Chapuys on January 3, 1534, in GAYANGOS, V., I, n. 1, p. 4.

⁴ The same on March 25, 1534; *ibid.* n. 31, p. 95.

sent away, while her confessor was replaced by a Lutheran.¹ She was given over to the care of a relative of Anne Boleyn, who daily caused her much sorrow, neglecting her in her illnesses,² and even striking her in the face.³ Anne Boleyn, her sworn enemy,⁴ thought of making her one of her train-bearers,⁵ and would have been most happy to have seen her on the scaffold.⁶ Indeed, her father threatened her with death,⁷ and she had only to thank the energetic intervention of the Emperor for her escape. In spite of all this severity, however, they did not succeed in what they aimed at, namely, in making her renounce her title and right to the throne. She could not, she said, declare her parents to be adulterers, or be disobedient to the Church.⁸

After the death of Anne Boleyn and her own mother, Mary was, indeed, induced, under fear of death, and in order to obtain the acknowledgment of her right to the throne, to sign a document recognizing the supremacy of the king, and declaring that her mother's marriage was invalid. Before doing so, however, she signed a protest declaring that document to have been obtained by force, and consequently illegal.⁹ She absolutely refused to hear of the Protestantism introduced by Somerset and Northumberland, and steadfastly refused, under the latter, to have the new liturgy celebrated in her house, until the king attained his majority; rather than do this she was prepared to lay her head on the block, and at length they ceased to press her any further.¹⁰

¹ The same on May 14, 1534; *ibid.* n. 57, p. 154-5.

² The same on November 18, 1534; *ibid.* n. 111, p. 329.

³ The same on February 11, 1534; *ibid.* n. 10, p. 34.

⁴ The same on March 30, 1534; *ibid.* n. 32, p. 96.

⁵ The same on January 29, 1534; *ibid.* n. 8, p. 27.

⁶ Ortiz on November 22, 1535; *ibid.* n. 231, p. 573. Cf. Catherine of Aragon on October 10, 1535; *ibid.* n. 210, p. 548.

⁷ Chapuys on April 22, 1534; *ibid.* n. 45, p. 129.

⁸ The same on May 14, 1534; *ibid.* n. 57, p. 155.

⁹ The same on October 8, 1536; *ibid.* V. 2, n. 104, 105.

¹⁰ LINGARD, VII., 70. ZIMMERMANN, 28 *seqq.* STEPHEN LEE, *loc. cit.*, 340.

The first acts of Mary's reign bore the stamp of that mildness which she everywhere displayed when she acted according to her own judgment, and followed the dictates of her own heart. Only seven of the conspirators against her were brought before the courts, and only three were executed. She would willingly have pardoned even Northumberland, if her Council had not opposed her.¹ Lady Jane Grey, whose execution was represented to Mary as inevitable, found a defender in her.² She was only brought before the courts and condemned after three months (on November 13th, 1553), but even then Mary endeavoured to have her kept in mild captivity.³ When the sermon of the royal chaplain, Bourne, was interrupted on August 13th, a decree followed declaring that the queen did not wish to force anyone's conscience, but to convert the people by the preaching of learned men.⁴ On the 18th of the same month a Royal Proclamation was issued, in which her subjects were enjoined to live peacefully and in Christian love with one another, by avoiding the newly discovered devilish expressions, "papist" and "heretic." The queen desired that everyone should be of her religion, but no force would be used until a final decision was arrived at.⁵

¹ LINGARD, VII., 127-8 n. The Venetian ambassador Soranzo writes on August 18, 1554, concerning Mary: "Her Majesty's countenance bears the impress of great goodness and mildness, which is not contradicted by her behaviour; for although she had many enemies, and so many of them had been condemned to death, if the Queen's wishes alone had had weight, then not one of the executions would have taken place." (BROWN, V., n. 934, p. 533). It caused great excitement when Northumberland declared himself a Catholic on the scaffold, and attributed all the troubles of recent years to the breach with the Church. His declaration was printed in London, in English, Latin and Dutch, and called forth, especially on the part of John Knox, many polemic rejoinders. Cf. Dict. of Nat. Biog., XVII., 110.

² LINGARD, VII., 126-7.

³ GAIRDNER, 326.

⁴ "That this was Mary's sincere intention at the outset of her reign, there is no reason to doubt," says GAIRDNER, 318.

⁵ *Ibid.* 318.

True to these principles, the queen was satisfied, in the meantime, by repealing various measures of the time of Edward VI., the legality of which she had never acknowledged. Bishops Bonner, Tunstall and Voysey were restored to their sees, while Gardiner, Heath and Day were again recognized as rightful bishops. Mary raised the distinguished statesman, Gardiner, to the dignity of chancellor. At the wish of the congregations, the celebration of the Latin Mass was again begun in several London churches on the Feast of St. Bartholomew, and the same was done in the cathedral on the following Sunday; Mass was not, however, regularly celebrated until the decision of Parliament was promulgated on December 21st.¹ For the deceased king a funeral service was, however, publicly held in accordance with the Book of Common Prayer, but a Requiem Mass was celebrated in the Tower in the presence of only 300 chosen participators.² The chancellors, Mason and Gardiner, restored the old statutes and the old religion in the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge. The foreign Protestants left the country, provided with passports, as did Vermigli and the French Protestants in London, to whom a special permission to leave was given, as well as letters to the mayors of Dover and Rye.³ Among the Protestant bishops who had usurped the places of the rightful occupants of the sees, Ridley, Coverdale and Hooper were sent to prison.⁴ Cranmer re-

¹ *Ibid.* 319-320.

² LINGARD, VII., 133. The Sienese ambassador in France, Claudio Tolomei, recognised in this, on August 31, 1553, the first sign that Mary wished to put an end to the schism: "La Reina Maria ne l'essequie del Rè suo fratello fece celebrar due Messe, l'una al modo inghilese e l'altra al modo romano; la qual cosa fa ancor segno ch'ella ha animo di tornare a l'obedienza de la Chiesa." (LUC. BANCHI, *Alcune Lettere politiche di Claudio Tolomei, vescovo di Tolone, scritte alla repubblica di Siena. ora primamente edite, Siena, 1868, 3* [Nozze Publication]). Charles V. considered the Mass said for Edward VI. to have been a mistake on the part of the Queen. ANCEL, *Réconciliation*, 530.

³ GAIRDNER, 321.

⁴ *Ibid.* 320.

mained confined to his palace till insulting letters from his pen against the Holy Mass were publicly read in the streets, whereupon he and Latimer were sent to the Tower in September.¹ Until the opening of Parliament, nothing had so far been said of the reconciliation of England with the Holy See.

In the Eternal City, however, and especially in the Pope's immediate surroundings, men eagerly discussed the question. Julius III. wept for joy when he learned, on August 5th, 1553, from a dispatch of the French nuncio, of Mary's victory and accession to the throne.² Cardinal Pole, who, as an Englishman, a relative of the queen, and the companion of her youth, took the deepest personal interest in these events, said in his answer to the Duchess of Mantua's letter of congratulation, that a more remarkable dispensation of Providence had not been experienced for many centuries.³

Deliberations were at once begun, as to how the interests of the Church could best be served in this favourable state of affairs. Pole, who had received the joyful intelligence one day later than the Pope, in the solitude of the Benedictine abbey of Maguzzano on the Lake of Garda, at once sent the abbot, Vincenzo Parpaglia, with a letter of congratulation to Julius III.⁴ He enjoined him to inform the Pope, by word of mouth,⁵

¹ GAIRDNER, 323.

² ANCEL, Réconciliation, 521.

³ "Et perchè questo è stato un efetto così grande della providentia di Dio, che l'età nostra et forse ancora delli nostri maggiori di molti secoli non ha visto il più notabile." *Pole to the Duchess of Mantua on September 12, 1553 (Gonzaga Archives, Mantua).

⁴ BROWN, V., n. 784. Cf. TH. PHILLIPS, *History of the Life of Reginald Pole*, Oxford, 1764; HOOK, *Lives of the Archbishops of Canterbury*, III., London, 1869; REUMONT's criticism in the *Bonn Theol. Lit. Bl.*, V., 998 *seqq.*; ZIMMERMANN, *Kardinal Pole, sein Leben und seine Schriften*, Ratisbon, 1893; MARTIN HAILE (Maria Hallé), *The Life of Cardinal Pole*, London, 1910. Concerning this last work, cf. ZIMMERMANN in the *Histor. Jahrb.*, XXXI., 818-9, and CONSTANT in the *Rév. des Quest. Hist.*, XC., 498 *seqq.*

⁵ Informatione del sig^r. Abbate di San Saluto (Solutore in Turin) (Corsini Library, Rome, 33, E 19, p. 4).

that in his, Pole's, opinion, everything that was good was to be hoped for from the new queen, who had steadfastly repudiated all the innovations during her brother's life, and had clung to the dogmas and rites of the Universal Church. The most serious matter, however, was the schismatical separation from Rome, against which no one in England had protested after the death of More and Fisher, and to which Mary herself had consented. As far as the queen personally was concerned, she would easily be persuaded to return, not only from conscientious motives, but also out of respect for her mother. For many others, however, the restoration of the Church property which had been seized, would prove a stumbling block ; in his opinion, the whole difficulty lay precisely in this point.¹ He thought, however, that the following measures might, in the meantime, be adopted. The Pope could, through his legates, cause the other sovereigns to take steps to approach Mary, and, in the same way, unofficial intermediaries, who, he hoped, would not be repulsed on this occasion, could appear in Pole's name, and endeavour to win over the queen. Should Mary agree to the sending of a Papal legate, then everything was gained ; should she, on the other hand, raise difficulties, then English members of Parliament could negotiate in friendly conferences with a legate and learned theologians in Flanders or in Picardy. It was to be hoped that the queen would not send bigoted persons to such a conference, for an endeavour must be made to win them over, so that they might work for the reconciliation of their own country.

¹ " Quello di che si può temere, è circa lo scisma, al quale anch' essa si trova haver consentito insieme con tutto il regno . . . benchè si sappia, che mal volontieri essa vi consentì, non solo per rispetto della coscienza, ma anche per ciò che il lasciare l'obbedienza della Sede apostolica era di diritto contrario alla causa della Regina sua madre et alla sua propria, onde si può credere, che etiandio in questa parte quanto alla persona sua non vi debba essere difficoltà, ma si bene per rispetto di molti, che sono interessati per li bene della Chiesa . . . Tal che a parer mio tutta la difficoltà sarà in questo punto " (*Loc. cit.* Corsini Library, Rome).

Before Parpaglia reached Rome with these instructions, he returned once more to Pole in Maguzzano, on August 12th, 1553, accompanied by a Papal envoy.¹ Julius III. had anticipated the proposals of the English Cardinal. Immediately after he had learned of Mary's accession he summoned, on the same day, a consistory of the Cardinals, in which Pole was appointed legate "to the Christian princes, and especially to the new queen." The matter appeared so urgent to the Pope that he would not wait for the drawing up of the Bull bestowing full powers on the legate, but sent an envoy to Pole on the following day with the brief of appointment. The Papal envoy met Parpaglia in Bologna, and he, in view of the altered conditions, did not continue his journey to Rome.²

Pole had now, as legate, to open communication with the queen and the Emperor. He sent Henry Penning with a letter to Mary on August 13th, and Antonio Fiordibello to Charles V. with a letter on the 21st of the same month.³ He earnestly exhorted the queen to the restoration of ecclesiastical unity, introduced himself as legate and begged her to state the time and manner in which he was to perform his mission. He besought the Emperor to promote the restoration of England to the Universal Church. Should Charles V. not consider that the proper time had arrived for taking such steps, then Fior-dibello was instructed to declare that the interests of Catholics could only be jeopardized by any procrastination. It was the custom in England that all those who considered that their rights had been infringed, should lay their complaints before the first Parliament of a new reign, and it would be an irreparable loss for Catholics did they not use this opportunity of vindicating their rights.⁴

Pole sent a second letter to Mary on August 27th ;⁵ every-

¹ ANCEL, 523.

² *Ibid.* 521-2.

³ BROWN, V., n. 766, 771. Concerning the date of n. 771, see ANCEL, 526.

⁴ BROWN, V., n. 772. Pole often returns to this view ; see ANCEL, 529, n. 2.

⁵ BROWN, V., n. 776 ; Italian in Corsini Library, 33, E. 19, p. 90. The letter was brought by Michael Throckmorton. *Ibid.*

body, he said, was anxiously waiting to know what the queen would do, and especially whether she would restore the title of Head of the Church to him upon whom the Lord of heaven and earth had bestowed it. The great importance of this question, Mary could, without the study of learned books, draw from the testimony of the men who had been looked upon as the most learned and pious in the land, More and Fisher, and which they had sealed with their blood. He himself had always founded his hopes for the restoration of England to the faith on these facts, in the face of many doubters, for the blood of the martyrs for the Holy See, and the prayers of so many persecuted Catholics, could not, in his opinion, remain for ever unanswered. This alliance with the centre of unity would be more valuable to the queen than the favour of foreign princes.

If Pole, at the close of his letter, spoke of himself as being about to leave Maguzzano, he was soon to be disappointed, for he was urged on all sides not to start for England for the time being.

When Pole, soon after his appointment as legate, sent Parpaglia to the Pope with the letter of August 13th, he had proposed, before taking any further steps, to apply to the nuncio in Brussels, Girolamo Dandino, and through him to obtain more detailed news as to the religious conditions in England.¹ Dandino had already anticipated this request; immediately on receiving the news of Mary's accession, he had sent the youthful Francesco Commendone to London, in order that he might privately collect information. What Commendone learned in England, however, was not very satisfactory.² He certainly found the queen, with whom, in the deepest secrecy, and through the Venetian ambassador, he obtained an audience, filled with the best will to restore her country to the

¹ BROWN, V., n. 767; cf. ANCEL, 525. Ipp. Capilupi announces on August 19th, 1553, to Cardinal E. Gonzaga concerning Pole's letter: "Heri in consistorio furono lette le lettere sue, et da S.Stà et dal collegio fu laudato la deliberatione fatta da S.S.R^{ma} (Gonzaga Archives, Mantua).

² Cf. Julius III. to Pole, September 20, 1553 (Nonciat. de France, I., n. 1).

Church, but she was prevented from doing so by the feeling of the people, who, for the most part, cherished a deadly hatred for the Holy See, by the self-interest of the many who had taken possession of the property of the Church and who sat among her councillors, and by the influence of her "heretical and schismatical" sister, Elizabeth, whom her father had preferred to the rightful queen, and "whose name was in the heart and mouth of everybody."¹ For all these reasons Mary wished that proceedings should be conducted with the greatest caution; no one was to know that there was any understanding between her and the Holy See.

Commendone returned to Dandino with this news at the end of August, and was at once sent by him to Rome. On September 15th, he communicated his experiences in London to the Cardinals in a consistory, without, however, referring to his audience with the Queen. His report made a deep impression, and it was quite evident that there was no need to hurry in sending a legate to England. The news which Dandino sent from Brussels also made any other decision impossible.

Even before Commendone's return to Brussels from England, Dandino had a conversation with Granvelle on August 14th. The Imperial minister emphasized the fact that they must give the queen time to gain a firm footing, as otherwise a revolt would break out which could certainly reckon on the ready support of France.² Diego di Mendoza, who had been for two years ambassador in England, also thought that there were fewer well-disposed people there than was supposed. The question of Church property was not a matter of indifference, even to the lower classes, on account of the duty of tithes, and they had now been for a long time accustomed to the freedom from these which heresy afforded them.³ On August 27th the Emperor informed Dandino, through Granvelle, that

¹ *Ibid.* 4.

² Dandino to Card. del Monte, on August 15, 1553, in ANCEL, 530.

³ *Ibid.*

he thought it inadvisable that Pole should go to England by way of Trent.¹

In the midst of all these reports Julius III. resolved to try a middle course.² He sent Pole to Brussels so that he might be nearer to England, but not with the title of legate to England, so that he might, together with Dandino, act as a mediator between the Emperor and France. On September 27th the legate received his new instructions, and on the 29th he left the Lake of Garda.³

Soon after his departure from Maguzzano Pole learned that Queen Mary also considered the presence of a legate in England impossible for the present. Penning, who had gone to London with a letter from Pole at the beginning of August, had at last sent news of the success of his mission.⁴ He only arrived in London on September 18th, 1553, and had a three hours' audience with the queen on the following day. She declared that she would give the half of her kingdom to have a legate in the country, but that the heretics were capable of anything when irritated, and that drastic measures were out of the question. The queen then repeated a request which she had already entrusted to Commendone, that permission should be given to hold regular church services in England, even before the interdict and censures against the country were removed.⁵ She especially wished to have a solemn High Mass celebrated as of old at her approaching coronation, which could not be deferred. Pole contented himself, in the meantime, by absolving Mary herself, and by exhorting her from Trent on October 2nd, not to depend too much on a purely secular policy, but to fix her trust more on God, repeating, at the same time, his

¹ *Ibid.* 530-531.

² Cf. the **report of the Florentine ambassador in Rome, of September 18, 1553 (State Archives, Florence).

³ ANCEL, 535, 744. By a *letter of September 27, Pole informed Cardinal Madruzzo of his impending arrival in Trent. Original in the Library at Trent.

⁴ ANCEL, Réconciliation, 745 *seqq.*

⁵ BROWN, V., n. 785, p. 408-409.

request that he might be allowed to return to his own country before the opening of her first Parliament.¹

Before this letter, however, reached its destination, the queen had been crowned on October 1st,² and on the 5th, Parliament had begun its sittings. Before its opening the queen, with all the members of both Houses, had, in accordance with the ancient custom, been present at a Mass of the Holy Ghost, and at the opening session congratulatory addresses, expressing affection for the queen's person, were offered on all sides. There were two questions, above all others, which Mary desired to have settled by her first Parliament: that the marriage of Catherine of Aragon should be recognized as valid, and that the ecclesiastical problem should be solved. As far as the latter was concerned the repudiation of the little loved liturgy of the Book of Common Prayer, and the return to the old form of service, offered little difficulty, but the submission to the Papal See was another matter. For thirty years preachers had been inveighing against the Pope, and the return to his authority seemed inextricably bound up with the restitution of Church property.

First of all the draft of a Bill, drawn up in quite ordinary terms, was laid before Parliament, which at a single stroke declared all the enactments of the last two reigns, relating either to the marriage of Catherine of Aragon or to the religion of the country, to be invalid. In the Upper House this met with no opposition, but the contrary was the case in the Lower House, where every attempt to establish the Papal authority was viewed with suspicion and violently opposed. The Lower House, wrote the queen on October 28th to Pole,³ could never be reconciled to the idea that the Crown should renounce the title of Head of the Church. She herself resolved that she would never, on any conditions, make use of such a title, and in the torturing uncertainty of how she was to act, should Parliament insist on her retaining it, she begged the legate to give her his advice.

¹ *Ibid.* n. 805.

² LINGARD, 137 *seqq.*

³ QUIRINI, IV., 119-121. ANCEL, 760.

The first attempt to win everything by a bold stroke had thus been frustrated by the hatred against the Papacy. The government therefore proceeded very cautiously. In the second session two new Bills were laid before Parliament, one of which related to the marriage of Queen Catherine, every reference to the Papal dispensation which had rendered it possible being carefully avoided. The object of the second Bill was to abolish all the religious laws issued under Edward VI. If this passed, the Catholic Church would not, it was true, be established, but Calvinism would at least be abolished. No opposition was raised in either House against the first Bill, but the other was debated for two days, and was finally, it appears, unanimously accepted on November 8th,¹ nor did the people raise any particular objection to it. It is true that placards with the new regulations were in many places torn down, and several Protestants held a meeting to consider what was to be done, but after some ten or twelve unruly agitators had been arrested, and two of them hanged, the others lost courage.²

A letter from the queen to Pole on November 15th informed him of the victory gained.³ The composition of the Parliament did not give much hope of winning anything further, but in three or four months another Parliament would be convoked, and the success already attained was, in the opinion of all the queen's friends, an auspicious beginning, which would pave the way for a return to the Church. The Bill concerning the marriage of her mother in itself constituted a recognition of the Holy See, as it was only on the authority of the latter that the validity of the marriage could be founded.

The bearer of this letter, Henry Penning, met Pole on November 30th in Dillingen,⁴ where the Cardinal had been

¹ LINGARD, 139-140.

² Renard on December 20, 1553, in ANCEL, 773.

³ QUIRINI, IV., 121-123.

⁴ "All'ultimo di Novembre a due ore di giorno arrivò monsignor Henrico a Tilinga con l'infrascritta speditione al cardinale Polo." Mary's letter of November 15, 1553, follows (Corsini Library, 33 E., 19, p. 419).

detained, very much against his will, since the middle of October. At first he had been kept back for some time by the necessity of obtaining passports through the different German territories,¹ and when he had at last started, on October 22nd, his journey was suddenly brought to an end two days later in Heidenheim (in the Jaxt-Circle),² by the wish of the Emperor. An Imperial envoy, the distinguished courtier, Juan de Mendoza, declared, in the name of his master, that the excited feeling in England might break out into open rebellion if a Papal legate were even to approach the country; Pole was, therefore, enjoined to wait, at least until the Emperor had come to an understanding with the Pope.³

Nothing now remained for the legate to do but to return to Dillingen, to the Bishop of Augsburg. A letter addressed to the Emperor on October 29th did not advance matters, nor nor did another letter sent to the Pope at the same time have any more success,⁴ for the Emperor had been working for a long time to prevent the mission of Pole, and he succeeded at length in winning Julius III. over to his views.

Even at the time when the nuncio, Dandino, the very man whom the English Cardinal was to replace as peacemaker, took leave of the Emperor in Brussels, on October 5th, Charles V. spoke plainly against the mission of Pole.⁵ Dandino endeavoured in that audience to represent the return of England to Catholic unity as an easy matter, and recommended Pole as the most suitable man for the position of English legate. The Emperor replied that Pole's appearance in England would afford the enemies of the Holy See in that country a pretext for stirring up a rebellion, in which case they were certain of being supported by France. One must not, he said, begin by

¹ BROWN, V., n. 816.

² Pole's letter to Charles V. of October 24, 1553, in BROWN, V, n. 819; *cf.* ANCEL, 757.

³ BROWN, V., n. 820.

⁴ See BROWN, V., n. 823, 820; ANCEL, 757.

⁵ The instructions of Charles V. to his ambassador in Rome of October 11, 1553 (Archives, Simancas) give us information concerning Dandino's audience; see ANCEL, 752, n. 2.

sending a legate, but proceed carefully, step by step. These considerations made an impression on Dandino, and he returned to Rome thoroughly convinced of the truth of the Emperor's arguments.

Similar views were put forward by a messenger, Francesco Vimercato, whom Dandino, shortly before his departure from Brussels, had sent to England.¹ Vimercato also came to the conclusion that conditions in England were not yet ready for the work of a Papal legate. The mere report that one was to be sent had already caused great excitement. Matters, therefore, must be very carefully considered. Why pluck the fruit before it was ripe, when it might still, by the grace of God, become mature? The devil had acquired such power in that country, which had sunk so deep in the mire of heresy that many people did not even believe in the immortality of the soul, and no longer knew God or honoured Him. Vimercato considered it almost a miracle that Mass was nearly everywhere restored.²

Julius III. was discouraged by these reports, and sent word to his legate on October 28th, that, for the present, he had better remain where he was. The Emperor was of opinion that the role of mediator between himself and France was not sufficient to justify Pole's presence in Brussels, and that people looked on the peace mediation as a mere transparent subterfuge. The Pope was so fully persuaded of the good-will of Charles V. that he unhesitatingly followed his advice.³

On the same day, October 28th, and again on November 15th,⁴ Pole also received most solemn warning from the queen against entering English territory. A premature appearance on the part of a Roman legate, in the prevailing state of suspicion and hatred against the Pope, would only do more harm than good.⁵ The people would murder him rather than allow

¹ ANCEL, 753-754.

² *Ibid.* 755.

³ Del Monte to Pole on October 28, 1553; Nonciat. de France, I., n. 4.

⁴ Concerning both letters *cf. supra* pp. 254 *seq.*

⁵ Letter of October 28, ; *cf.* ANCEL, 759-760.

him to exercise the duties of his office.¹ Penning received a verbal communication from Mary that it was at her urgent request that the Emperor had restrained the English Cardinal from his purpose. "It is true, however," remarks Penning, "that this caution on the part of the queen is entirely owing to the representations of the Imperial ambassador, with whom she discusses all her affairs." Several members of Parliament had assured him that the arrival of the Cardinal would give pleasure to everyone, and that the only difficulty in the way of reconciliation to Rome was the return of Church property.² Noailles, the French ambassador in London, also declared, at this time, that Pole's appearance in England was desired by Protestants as well as Catholics.³ Great hopes were placed in the influence Noailles had over Mary, for the settlement of a question which for the moment occupied England to the exclusion of all others—this was the marriage of the queen.

Up to this time, the idea of a reigning queen on the throne of England had been something unheard of, and nobody in the country believed that Mary could maintain her position without a consort.⁴ Her ministers therefore urged from the very

¹ Letter of November 15; cf. ANCEL, 760.

² "Mons. Henrico dice, che la Regina gli approvò la fermata di mons. rmo, dicendo che lei stessa aveva fatta istanza alla M^{ta} Cesarea, che le facesse fermare . . . La causa che la muove a procedere tanto reservata nasce dal consiglio e persuasioni degli ambasciatori della Maestà Cesarea, alli quali comunica il tutto. Dice similmente mons. Henrico per quanto egli ha potuto penetrare per le parole di alcuni del Parlamento, che l'andata di mons. rmo nostro sarebbe accetta e grata a tutti universalmente, ma che la restitutione dell'obbedienza partirebbe qualche difficoltà, non per altro che per l'interesse delli beni ecclesiastici occupati." Relatione di mons. Henrico, November 30, 1553 (Corsini Library, 33 E. 19, p. 43).

³ In LINGARD, 142.

⁴ GAIRDNER (328) says: "A Queen-regnant was then a novelty in England and no one supposed she could maintain her position without a husband." Cf. LEE in the Dict. of Nat. Biog., XXXVI., 342.

beginning, that she should, in spite of her thirty-seven years, seek a husband. Many different proposals were made. From among her subjects, Edward Courtenay, a scion of the royal house of York, who had been placed in the Tower at the age of twelve, after the execution of his father in 1539, but whom Mary had set at liberty and created Earl of Devonshire,¹ was specially put forward; Mary is said also to have considered Cardinal Pole, who was not yet a priest.² Many foreign princes were named as candidates, as for example, the King of Denmark, Philip of Spain, a son of Ferdinand, King of the Romans, the Infante of Portugal, and the Duke of Savoy. The queen, it appears, would have preferred Courtenay, who was beloved by the people on account of his youth and good looks, and because of his unjust imprisonment in the Tower, and he was also the chosen candidate of Gardiner. Mary, however, laid this important matter before the Emperor, her usual adviser.

Charles V. had already proved himself a true friend and protector of Mary in the troubles of her youth, and she thought that she could trust him above all others, now that she was queen.³ She had already asked his advice when it was a question of the punishment of Lady Jane Grey and the rebels, as well as in the solution of the religious problems,⁴ and if she had considered his decision regarding the rebellion too severe,

¹ He translated the work "De Beneficio Christi" (*cf.* Vol. XII., of this work p. 496) into English while in the Tower, perhaps to incline Edward VI. favourably towards him. *Cf.* Dict. of Nat. Biog., XII., 336.

² She is said to have asked Commendone if the Pope would release the Cardinal from the obstacle of his orders (A. M. GRATIANI, *De Vita I. F. Commendone*, Paris, 1669, p. 44). ANCEL (751, n. 4) rejoins that Pole had never thought of marrying; but the question is whether Mary did not think of such a marriage. It is erroneous to state that Pole offered himself as bridegroom in a letter contained in the Archives of Simancas; see GAIRDNER, in the Dict. of Nat. Biog., XLVI., 46.

³ *Cf. supra* p. 245.

⁴ LINGARD, 126.

and had repudiated,¹ at least in the beginning, his advice concerning the religious question, as a sort of cowardice, she nevertheless came round more and more to his way of thinking, and her confidence in him remained unshaken to the end.

The accession of Mary opened new and brilliant prospects for the policy of Charles V. His constant adversary, the King of France, seemed to have succeeded in uniting the crowns of Scotland and France on the head of his son, Francis, and the Scottish queen, Mary Stuart, was already receiving her education at the French court, as the bride of the heir to the throne. If the Emperor could now succeed in marrying his son Philip to the English queen, then the House of Hapsburg would have obtained a new crown, and perhaps a new kingdom, by marriage, and the brilliant diplomatic success of his French rival would be eclipsed. These plans of the Emperor were, at any rate, one reason why Charles wished to keep the Papal legate far from England, for Pole was looked upon as an opponent of the Spanish marriage, and the religious change might call troubles into being which would cross or, in any case, delay the Imperial designs.

As early as August 14th, 1553, Charles V. gave his ambassador in England, Simon Renard, instructions, written in his own hand, to proceed carefully, and step by step, until he had brought about Mary's marriage with Philip.² Renard's task was rendered easier by the behaviour of Philip's most dangerous rival, Courtenay. This young man was wanting in firmness and moral rectitude; he endeavoured to compensate himself for all his deprivations during his years of captivity, by unbridled licence in the company of notorious women, and he thereby lost more and more the respect of the virtuous queen. On September 20th, Renard was able to inform his master that Mary had definitely given up all thought of Courtenay. The Emperor then caused it to be pointed out to her that a foreign

¹ ANCEL, 532.

² LINGARD, 130. Cf. for the history of Mary's Spanish marriage, the very searching investigations recently published by CONSTANT in the *Rév. d'hist. dipl.*, XXVI., parts I. and II.

prince would be more suitable for the position of royal consort than either Courtenay or Pole. He was himself too old to have the honour of sueing for her hand, but although he might not offer himself as a bridegroom, he would at least solicit her favour for the one who was nearest his heart, his son Philip.¹

Although Philip was eleven years younger than she was, this proposal made an impression on Mary. The union with "so powerful and so Catholic a Prince" appeared to offer the necessary guarantee that she "would be able to re-establish and confirm religion in England;" as she afterwards made known to Pole,² it was especially for this reason, and because she wished to reassure the country by the hope of an heir, that she had consented to marry at all.

The intention of the queen was hardly rumoured before it aroused violent opposition. The greater nobles were dissatisfied because they did not wish for a powerful prince, and the Protestant party because they feared a Catholic Regent.³ The common people were excited by the illusion that England's independence would be endangered by the connection with the power of Spain. The jealousy of France was naturally aroused to the highest pitch by a union between England and the Hapsburgs. The French ambassador in London, Noailles, joined the Protestant party and all the other malcontents, and incited the people against the queen by every means in his power.⁴

Among the confidants of the queen, Gardiner advised her in the most decided manner against the Spanish marriage, and he had the greater part of the nobility on his side, although a few of them, with Norfolk, Arundel and Paget at their head, approved of the queen's plan.⁵ The Commons resolved on an address in which the queen was indeed requested to marry, but only to choose her husband from among the nobles of England. This opposition, however, in which Mary thought

¹ LINGARD, 131.

² BROWN, V., n. 882, p. 489.

³ ZIMMERMANN, 58.

⁴ LINGARD, 143.

⁵ *Ibid.* 131 *seqq.*, 142-3.

she saw only an intrigue of Gardiner, irritated the queen. On October 30th, the day on which Parliament had passed the address, she summoned Renard to her presence. She led him into her oratory, knelt down before the Blessed Sacrament, and after invoking the Holy Ghost, made a solemn vow that she would take no other husband than Philip.¹ When the Commons appeared before her on November 17th and read her the address, Mary answered them in person. Hitherto, she said, the rulers of England have been independent and free to arrange their marriages, and I am not prepared to give up this right ; in the choice of a husband I shall think of my own happiness as well as of the well-being of the kingdom.²

Opposition had gradually to give way before such determination, and the Imperial envoys, the Count of Egmont and Laing, accompanied by two others, landed in Kent on January 2nd, 1554, to ask, in proper form, on the part of Philip, for Mary's hand. Mary referred them to the Royal Council, who, she said, knew her intentions ; her first husband, however, was her kingdom, and nothing would induce her to be untrue to the fidelity which she had promised it in her coronation oath.³ On the 14th the marriage settlement was signed and made public. It had been drawn up by the clever statesman, Gardiner, and made any dependence of England on Spain absolutely impossible. Philip was to assist the queen in the government of the kingdom, but all the offices of state were only to be held by natives of the country ; if Philip should outlive the queen, he would have no right to the succession.⁴

In spite of these careful provisions, however, the official announcement of the marriage gave the Protestant party in the country a welcome pretext for instigating the people to rise, and in the choice of means for so doing they were by no means too particular. The most incredible stories were

¹ *Ibid.* 144. STONE, in the Dublin Review, XXIII., 333.

² LINGARD, 146.

³ *Ibid.* 147 (H. GRIFFET) Nouveaux éclaircissements sur l'histoire de Marie, Paris, 1766, xxx.

⁴ LINGARD, 147-148. RYMER, Foedera, XV., 377.

circulated ; the country, it was said, would be inundated with foreigners, and the English would be made slaves and dragged away to the mines of Mexico.¹ A plot was set on foot to marry Elizabeth to Courtenay, and to place them both on the throne ; this plot was to be put into execution after the arrival of Philip.²

The shrewd Gardiner, however, succeeded in getting the whole secret from Courtenay, and thereby forced the conspirators to put their plans into immediate execution, in spite of their want of preparation.³ In order to organize the revolt, Carew went to Devonshire, Croft to the borders of Wales, the Duke of Suffolk, who probably hoped to place his daughter, Lady Jane Grey, upon the throne, into Warwickshire, and Thomas Wyatt into Kent. The success of these instigators of revolt was, on the whole, very small, and after a fortnight, the Duke of Suffolk was again in the Tower, from which he had only a little while before been released by the clemency of Mary, while Carew was a fugitive in France, and Croft a prisoner of the crown.⁴

The only dangerous rising was that stirred up by Sir Thomas Wyatt in Kent.⁵ The enthusiasm of the 1500 men who were soon under arms, quickly died away, it is true, so that numbers of them soon began to desert, but when the troops which Mary had sent against them under the Duke of Norfolk went over to Wyatt, an army several thousand strong was soon marching on London. In the general panic which seized the Council, the queen remained full of courage and confidence in her victory. She had sent an envoy at the commencement of the rising to find out what were the demands of Wyatt, but when he brought back an insolent answer and conditions

¹ GAIRDNER, 330 ; *cf.* LINGARD, 149.

² LINGARD, 149.

³ *Ibid.* 150.

⁴ GAIRDNER, 330. LINGARD, 151-2.

⁵ JOHN PROCTOR, *History of Wyate's Rebellion*, London, 1555. R. P. CRUDEN, *History of Gravesend* (1842), 172 *seqq.* GAIRDNER, 330 *seqq.* ZIMMERMANN, 59 *seqq.* LEE in the *Dict. of Nat. Biog.*, LXIII., 187 *seqq.*

impossible of fulfilment, she resolved to face the danger boldly. She ordered the Lord Mayor to summon an extraordinary meeting of the citizens of London in the Guildhall on February 1st, 1554. Mary appeared there, with the royal sceptre in her hand, surrounded by her ladies and officers of state, and made a speech to those assembled, full of masculine power and determination. She complained, in dignified words, of the disobedience and insolence of the rebels. They had at first only attacked her marriage with the Spaniard, but now it was clear what the actual intentions of her enemies were. She was to entrust her person, the guarding of the Tower, and the appointment of her councillors to rebellious subjects who were striving after the possession of the royal power and the abolition of religion. She, however, trusted her people, who would not deliver her over to the insurgents. As regards the Spanish marriage, she had only acted on the advice of her Council ; she had so far remained unmarried, and with the help of God, could continue to do so. Should, however, the marriage with Philip not gain the approval of Parliament, then she gave her royal word that she would never marry all the days of her life.

This speech had an immediate success. Next morning more than 20,000 men had volunteered for the defence of the capital. Wyatt, meanwhile, continued his march, and on February 3rd he encamped on the right bank of the Thames, in Southwark. Here, however, he was exposed to the fire of the cannon in the Tower, and withdrew from his position within three days. The danger was not yet over, however. On February 7th, at two o'clock in the morning, Mary received the news, in her palace at Whitehall, that Wyatt was advancing and was already not far away, and that she had better seek refuge in the Tower as quickly as possible. The bold leader had succeeded, in spite of the fact that the bridges were destroyed, in crossing the river, and, with the connivance of several traitors, who were waiting to open one of the gates to him, he was now marching, not far from Whitehall, on the city of London. Everybody in the palace thought of treachery, Gardiner on his knees besought the queen to flee to Windsor,

but when Renard assured her that her flight would be the signal for a general rising of the malcontents and the massacre of the Catholics, and as, moreover, the leaders of the royal troops swore fealty, Mary declared firmly and steadfastly that she would remain at her post. Wyatt's attempt proved to be a complete failure ; half of his undisciplined levies had already run away on their approach to London, while others made their escape in the darkness of the night. The royal troops succeeded in cutting Wyatt off from the main body of his army, and he was captured and subsequently executed, the remainder of his force being dispersed.

The Spanish marriage had only been a pretext for the rising in the case of Wyatt, as well as in that of the Duke of Suffolk. The true reason lay in the fear of the Protestants that Mary would restore the Catholic religion.¹ Wyatt expressed himself to this effect in private,² and his followers venerated him after his death on account of his " zeal for God's truth " as a martyr.³

In spite of its want of success, the rising of Wyatt forms a landmark in the reign of Mary. Till then it had made little impression on her when the Emperor and his ministers had recommended severity against the malcontents, and had impressed upon her that such people were not to be won by clemency, but were only confirmed in their arrogance and incited to fresh disobedience. The recent events, and especially the rising of the Duke of Suffolk, now came as a clear proof of monstrous ingratitude. Mary resolved, therefore,

¹ " It was in truth, an heretical conspiracy with a political pretext." (GAIRDNER, 330).

² *Ibid.* " In Kent, Wyatt said to an adherent, who expressed the hope that he would establish religion : Hush ! the word religion must not be mentioned, for that would turn the hearts of many away from us. You must only complain of the inundation of foreigners. But, in confidence, I shall tell you as a friend, we mean in reality only the establishment of God's word." Cf. Pole in BROWN, V., n. 854, p. 461, and the suggestions in LINGARD, 153, 157, 158.

³ GAIRDNER, 330.

to take stern measures. Fifty of the soldiers who deserted were hanged, as well as six of the rebels in Kent. Four of the ringleaders were sent to the scaffold, namely, the Duke of Suffolk, his brother and principal adviser, Thomas Grey, Thomas Wyatt and the former secretary of the Council, William Thomas, who had urged the murder of the queen. Four hundred rebels were also made to appear before the queen with halters round their necks and beg for forgiveness upon their knees, whereupon she graciously pardoned them.

These punishments could certainly not be quoted as a proof of undue severity, but it must be regretted that the queen allowed herself to be persuaded into abandoning her former attitude of clemency towards Lady Jane Grey. On February 8th, when she had hardly escaped from the attack of Wyatt, and was still feeling the effects of the recent dangers and anxieties, she was induced to give the order for the carrying out of the sentence pronounced in November, 1553, but afterwards deferred, on the unhappy tool of a criminal policy. On February 12th, 1554, Lady Jane Grey, as well as her husband, suffered death with great courage at the hands of the executioner.¹

The victory which had been gained, however, strengthened the position of the government more than any measures of severity. The Spanish marriage, concerning which many had despaired during the rising, now met with hardly any opposition. Parliament unanimously confirmed the marriage treaty on May 5th.² The representatives of the country had been given to understand that the only means of providing a counterpoise to the threatened union between France and Scotland lay in the marriage of Mary with the Spanish prince, as the heir of Philip and Mary would bring Flanders to the

¹ The Chronicle of Lady Queen Jane and of two years of Queen Mary, ed. by J. G. NICHOLS, 1850. G. HOWARD, Lady Jane Grey and her times, London, 1822. A. STRICKLAND, Tudor Princesses, London, 1868. P. SIDNEY, Jane the Queen, London, 1900. R. DAVEY, The nine days Queen: Lady Jane Grey and her times, London, 1909.

² LINGARD, 171.

English crown. No prejudice to England or the English people could follow on the marriage. On July 19th, Philip, accompanied by the united fleets of England, Spain and Flanders, appeared in sight of the English coast,¹ and on the following day he landed on English soil. On July 25th, the Feast of the Patron Saint of Spain, St. James, the marriage was celebrated at Winchester, with the greatest pomp. Before the ceremony, Gardiner read aloud the documents by which Charles V. abdicated the thrones of Naples and the Duchy of Milan in favour of his son, so that Philip might give his hand to the English queen as a reigning sovereign.

The plan of the Spanish marriage had been joyfully welcomed in Rome from the beginning. When the negotiations concerning this union which was so warmly desired by the Emperor were concluded in December, 1553, Charles at once sent the joyful news to Rome. The Pope received the announcement on the morning of New Year's Day, and he congratulated the Emperor in a warmly expressed brief, of the same date.² Among the Cardinals, Morone, in particular, had done everything he could to promote the union of Mary with the heir to the Spanish throne.³

Cardinal Pole, on the other hand, was regarded in Rome, as well as by the Emperor and in France, as an opponent of the Spanish marriage. He seems to have made his views known as early as October 2nd, at the very beginning of his English legation, when he addressed a letter from Trent to Edward Courtenay.⁴ On October 27th, in a report to the Pope, he declared that he was kept in Dillingen and away from England because it was feared that he would never co-operate in deliver-

¹ *Viage de Felipe Segundo a Inglaterra*, ed. GAYANGOS, Sociedad de Bibliófilos Españoles, 1877. *English Historical Review*, 1892, 253 *seqq.*

² Printed in RAYNALDUS, 1554, n. 1. It is given there as follows: "Quo nuntio vix quidquam nobis gratius potuit accidere."

³ ANCEL, 762.

⁴ BROWN, V., n. 806.

ing his country into the hands of a foreigner.¹ In February, 1554, the English ambassador in France wrote that people there were of the opinion that Pole had worked against the marriage of the queen with Philip.² This report, however, was unjust ; at the same time the Cardinal, as he himself acknowledged, had, from the first, been of opinion that Mary had better, at her age, remain unmarried.³

In Rome, the news of the legate's attitude was received with inquietude. Cardinal Morone was enjoined to inform him, on behalf of the Pope, on December 21st, 1553,⁴ that an ambassador had no right to put forward his own views, but only those of his sovereign. The Pope was convinced, for many reasons, that the English queen should bestow her hand on the Spanish prince ; he considered the queen too weak to be able permanently to govern, without the support of a husband, her violent and unsettled subjects, who were, moreover, infected by the religious innovations. He, further, did not believe that one of the nobles of England would be in a position, as husband of the queen, to reduce the country to obedience, both on account of the different parties in the state, and of the intrigues of foreign powers, while, in order to sweep his rivals from the field, a native prince would be much more likely to have recourse to dangerous concessions. On the other hand, the King of Spain, who was England's neighbour by reason of his possessions in Spain and Flanders, could re-establish ecclesiastical unity in England by his great authority, and defend the queen against her enemies at home and abroad. For these reasons the Pope considered it not only a rash thing to oppose the marriage, but also detrimental to religion and the interests of the Holy See, and he therefore wished Pole to adopt this view. Should he appear at the Imperial court,

¹ *Ibid.* n. 820, p. 437.

² ANCEL, 764.

³ BROWN, V., 856, p. 464.

⁴ See the text of the important *declaration, which escaped even Ancel, according to the manuscript in the Corsini Library, in Appendix No. 21b.

he was requested to show himself favourable, by word and deed, to the Spanish marriage, so as to satisfy the Emperor. As Morone added, the Pope was not without anxiety as to whether Pole would yield to him. Julius had often said that it was folly to oppose oneself to a rushing stream ; to wear oneself out in vain and win nothing was the height of folly. Morone believed that he could allay the Pope's fears ; he said that Pole would keep God before his eyes and would never act contrary to the will of His Holiness. Pole was also requested to keep these representations of the Pope a secret, out of consideration for Italian and foreign princes. A brief of the same time from Julius III. to Pole,¹ enjoined the latter to have confidence in the advice of Morone.

¹ Brief of December 20, 1553, mentioned in ANCEL, 762.

CHAPTER X.

LEGATION OF CARDINAL POLE.—THE RECONCILIATION OF ENGLAND WITH THE HOLY SEE.

MARY had, even before her marriage with Philip, been encouraged by the increased respect felt for the Crown since the victory over the rebels, to take further steps towards a Catholic restoration.

In so doing, she was entering upon an undertaking, the prospects of which were by no means hopeless.¹ Paget wrote to Somerset, in the year 1549, that eleven-twelfths of the country was Catholic at heart.² According to the opinion of an English Protestant, who had taken refuge on the continent, the country people still clung so firmly to the Papacy in 1553, that the nobles could only allow themselves the preaching of the "Gospel" within their four walls.³ When Commendone and Vimercato had depicted conditions in England in such dark colours, they had only the state of affairs in the capital in their minds. "The people of London," wrote Dandino in reference to this, "are, it is true, hardened in their heresy, but in the rest of the country it is not so to the same extent."⁴

It was especially from two classes of the population that Mary had to fear resistance to her attempts at restoration: first, from the lowest orders, who had been the most influenced by the foreign preachers, and consequently gave free vent to

¹ ANCEL, 771 *seqq.*

² LINGARD, 60.

³ Cf. Dodmer's letter to Calvin, of December 17, 1553: *Calvini Opera*, XIV. (Corp. Ref. XLII.), 706.

⁴ ANCEL, 774.

their hatred in the most crude manner,¹ and secondly, from the wealthy and noble class, who wished to hear nothing of a return to the old religion because they feared that they would be forced to restore the Church property ; from these, however, there was less opposition to a Catholic restoration on the ground of any religious conviction. In the confusion of constantly changing doctrines and confessions of faith, they had for the most part lost all hold on religion, and were ready, at the word of the government, to accept almost any doctrine.²

Among the measures of 1554, several related to the restoration of the old form of worship, while the Mass had already been re-established by an Act of Parliament in December, 1553 ;³ now, on March 21st, 1554, an ordinance of the Council was promulgated, according to which the nobility of the country districts were ordered to erect altars in their village churches, within fourteen days.⁴ In Holy Week and Easter Week the ceremonies of the Church were carried out in the old Catholic manner, while Mary herself, accompanied by four

¹ " One morning a tom-cat was found hanging on the gallows in priest's clothes, with the tonsure and a picture of the Host in its paws. On May 10, 1554, a gun was fired in church at the preacher, Pendleton. In both cases the perpetrator remained undiscovered." (GAIRDNER, 339). The voice in Aldersgate street should also be mentioned here. A voice was heard in an old wall which declared that the Mass was idolatry ; when a blessing was invoked on Elizabeth the voice answered Amen, but when the same was invoked for Mary, the voice remained silent. As many as 600 people assembled to hear the " angel voices " until the government drew the originator of the disturbance from within the wall and placed him in the pillory. Renard to the Emperor, on March 14, 1554, in ANCEL, 774. Cf. LINGARD, 171 ; GAIRDNER, 340.

Cf. The recent publication : CONSTANT, *La commencement de la restauration catholique en Angleterre par Marie Tudor* (1553). Rev. Hist., 1913.

² LINGARD, 175.

³ Cf. *supra* p. 247.

⁴ Acts of the Privy Council, 1552-1554, p. 411. LEE, 344.

bishops, took part in the processions during the Rogation Days.¹

Mary's principal care, however, was directed to bringing about a thorough reform of the clergy, and on March 1st, measures were taken against married clergy. As the ecclesiastical edicts of Edward VI. had already been repealed by Mary's first Parliament, the old law of the Church, which allows of no married priesthood, again came into force, and the government considered that it was, therefore, justified in expelling them. About a fifth or a sixth part of the entire clergy, and a fourth in the diocese of London, were affected by this measure. A considerable number, however, received new appointments, when they had done penance, and had put away their wives.² Many of the Protestant bishops had already been deprived of their offices, and quite apart from the fact that many of them were guilty of high treason, the government had the right to proceed independently in their case, for the bishops appointed by Edward acknowledged themselves that they had received their power from the king,³ so that the sovereign was entitled again to withdraw it from them. It was another matter, however, when it came to the question of appointing new bishops in the place of those who had been removed, as, for this, it was necessary to have the sanction of the Pope. In a letter of February 24th Mary laid the matter before Pole,⁴ and thus, for the first time after his long period of waiting, Pole was called upon to act in his official capacity as Papal legate.

Pole had been obliged, since the middle of October, 1553, to spend the remainder of the year in painful inactivity in Dillingen. Not until December 28th did the longed for invitation of the Emperor reach him, not indeed to proceed to England, but to begin to carry out his mission as peace-

¹ GAIRDNER, 336. LEE, 344.

² GAIRDNER, 337.

³ LINGARD, 18, 24. The dignity of bishop was bestowed with the proviso: "quamdiu bene se gesserint." *Ibid.*, 175 n.

⁴ BROWN, V., n. 859. Cf. Mary to Pole, January 23, 1554, *ibid.*, n. 849.

maker between Charles and the King of France.¹ On January 25th, 1554, he made his solemn entry into Brussels,² and in February he repaired to the French court. Henry II. received him in a friendly manner, but Pole was unable to accomplish any more in his case than he had previously been able to do with the Emperor.³

Pole received Mary's letter in France. The English queen was exceedingly anxious that the new bishops should be consecrated before the opening of Parliament on April 2nd, so that they could take part at once in the sessions, and in the religious discussions throw their influence into the scales. She enclosed a list of ten or twelve suitable candidates.⁴

Pole's powers, however, did not extend so far as to enable him fully to satisfy the queen's wishes, since no one could have foreseen such a remarkable state of things at the beginning of his legation, as that there should be an appointment of bishops before the reconciliation of the kingdom with the Holy See. As the matter, however, was urgent, Pole sent a confidential messenger to London to tell the queen that it was necessary that the bishops chosen should, before their consecration, at least reconcile themselves with the Holy See; they must either apply to the Papal legate individually, or they could send him an authorized representative, who would seek reconciliation in the name of all of them, or, again, Pole would send an envoy to England fully empowered to arrange the matter.⁵ Pole wrote on March 2nd to Julius III.,⁶ who sent him a brief on the 8th of the same month, giving him the full authority required.⁷ In accordance with this brief Pole could elevate

¹ ANCEL, 762.

² Pole to Julius III., January 28, 1554, in BROWN, V., n. 850.

³ GACHARD, *La Bibliothèque Corsini*, 116-7, Brussels, 1896. MARTIN, Pole, IV., 341-2. ANCEL, 763-4. ACTON gives emendations on Gachard's work in the *North British Review*, LI., 193 seqq., 1869-1870.

⁴ BROWN, V., n. 859.

⁵ Muzzarelli, to del Monte, March 16, 1554, in ANCEL, 775-6.

⁶ BROWN, V., n. 862.

⁷ Printed in WILKINS, *Concilia*, IV., 91-2, and in the *Docum. ad legat. card. Poli spectantia*, Rome, 1895.

to offices in metropolitan and cathedral churches such persons as had accepted ecclesiastical positions from laymen and schismatics, even in the case of those who had themselves been tainted with heresy. These concessions, however, appeared so unusual to the Pope himself, that he did not venture to lay them before the Cardinals for approval, from fear of opposition, but only discussed the matter with Morone.¹

On April 1st, the eve of the opening of Parliament, Gardiner was able to consecrate six new bishops. In a letter written on April 7th in her own hand Mary begged the Pope to give his explicit confirmation, thereby acknowledging for the first time, publicly and solemnly, the Papal Supremacy. Julius III. read the royal letter, with many tears, five times to the assembled Cardinals,² granted the desired confirmation in a consistory of July 6th, and in a brief of July 10th, joyfully acknowledged the queen's zeal.³

The Parliament which met on April 2nd was rather concerned with the marriage of the queen than with the religious question. While the sessions were being held, much attention was attracted by a debate conducted by the Convocation of the clergy at Oxford with the three leaders of the Protestants, Cranmer, Ridley and Latimer, which was held simultaneously with the Parliamentary sittings from April 14th to the 20th. On the 27th the result, which was favourable to the Catholics, was announced, and on the 30th the Dean of Rochester, Walter Philips, acknowledged once more the doctrine of Transubstantiation, and retracted his former views. As had happened formerly under Edward VI., when the Catholics had complained, in similar circumstances, of the want of freedom of speech, so did the Protestants now raise similar objections.⁴

¹ ANCEL, 776.

² RAYNALDUS, 1554, n. 7. Mon. Ign. Ser. I, IV., 665.

³ RAYNALDUS, 1554, n. 5-7.

⁴ LINGARD, 197. GAIRDNER, 338. A second disputation, planned to take place at Cambridge, fell through as the Protestant theologians refused to take part in it. ZIMMERMANN, 72.

Among the Bills laid before Parliament, one is deserving of particular attention, although it was rejected in the House of Lords. All bishops, and especially the Bishop of Rome, were expressly forbidden by the Bill to demand the restitution of Church property.¹ The matter which formed the last and greatest obstacle to the return of the country to the Church, was here plainly put forward. In order that she might succeed in settling this difficult question, the queen had once more to seek the help of the legate, who had returned to Brussels on April 19th.

Pole was much perplexed by Mary's request. In the brief appointing him legate for England, the Cardinal had only received authority to forego the restoration of the revenues which had been drawn by the wrongful possessors from the sequestrated Church property. Of the renunciation of the said real estate of the Church, there had been no mention; on the contrary, the text of the brief made it pretty clear that, as a rule, the return of the real estate wrested from the Church was insisted upon previous to the giving up of the revenues.² It had become quite clear by this time that the legate's authority was not sufficiently comprehensive, so Pole sent Niccolò Ormanetto from Brussels to Rome on April 24th, and Henry Penning to London on May 4th, to negotiate further with the Pope and the queen concerning this burning question.³ Ormanetto had, besides this, to report on the legate's mission to France.⁴

Mary pressed for a speedy answer. In the first audience granted to Penning, she at once asked what was being arranged with regard to the Church property, and as often as she saw him, she returned to the same subject.⁵ In her own opinion

¹ ANCEL, 778.

² In the "Documenta," p. 6, quoted *supra*, p. 273, n. 7, it is stated: "Cum possessoribus bonorum ecclesiasticorum (restituis prius, si tibi expedire videretur, immobilibus per eos indebite detentis) super fructibus male perceptis ac bonis mobilibus consumptis concordandi, etc."

³ ANCEL, 779.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 767.

⁵ *Ibid.*, 779 n., 3, 780 n. 3.

the Pope should show himself as generous as possible, and absolutely forego the return of the Church property. Pole, on the other hand, would not consent to such a solution.¹ Such a procedure he thought would give an appearance of bargaining about the return of the country to the Church ; England should, he maintained, first come back to the Church, and leave everything else to the Pope's generosity. This view of the matter, however, appeared too severe to Muzzarelli, the nuncio in Brussels, and also to the Pope himself. In a brief of June 28th, Julius III. gave his legate the fullest authority to leave all Church property, moveable and real, in the hands of the present possessors.² Unfortunately, however, the terms of the brief³ did not exclude all doubt as to the Pope's intentions, and later on aroused distrust in the hearts of suspicious persons.

The brief arrived in Brussels on July 29th.⁴ A few days before, the Spanish marriage had been celebrated, and it now seemed as though the longed-for hour had at last come when Pole could perform the duties of his office as legate on English soil. In the meantime, however, fresh difficulties had arisen, of such a serious character that Pole himself regarded his mission as no longer possible of execution, and begged the Pope to recall him.

The Cardinal had had no success in his peace mission to France, and he had aroused the displeasure of the Emperor by his premature departure. When he presented himself before Charles V. on April 21st, and made his report concerning the unfortunate result of his mission, the Emperor, instead of answering him, declared that if he had nothing further to say,

¹ *Ibid.*, 779, 780.

² WILKINS, *Concilia*, IV., 102-3. WEISS, *papiers de Granvelle*, IV., 264. ANCEL, 781.

³ Pole received authority to deal with the question of Church lands "arbitrio tuo auctoritate nostra tractandi, concordandi, transigendi, componendi, et cum eis, ut prae-fata sine ullo scrupulo in posterum retinere possint, dispensandi."

⁴ ANCEL, 781.

it would be much better if he did not appear before him again.¹ The Cardinal had made his position still worse by omitting to send the Emperor any communication from France concerning the steps he had taken with the king, and by never referring, by a single word, to the Spanish marriage, in his correspondence with the queen. The old suspicion that he was opposed to the marriage was again revived, and people even went so far as to suspect him of favouring Wyatt's insurrection. His very sojourn on French soil was regarded as an expression of friendship for the power which was Mary's worst enemy, and gave rise to a demonstration, from which Pole withdrew by a speedy departure.²

Not only had Pole's work as peacemaker completely failed, but his mission to England, which could not take place without the agreement of the Emperor, seemed quite hopeless. The deeply offended legate withdrew to the abbey of Dilighem near Brussels,³ and it was from there that he conducted the above mentioned negotiations concerning the Church property, but otherwise he completely withdrew from political life. As early as the beginning of May he had begged the Pope to appoint someone else in his place as legate for England.⁴ In Rome, however, under no circumstances could such an idea be entertained; by the recall of a Prince of the Church, once appointed and so solemnly dispatched, they would have compromised themselves in the eyes of the whole world, and, perhaps, have irretrievably endangered the return of England to the Church. Pole's painful position during these months of uncertainty and delay, was rendered still more bitter by the knowledge that his attitude was not sanctioned in every respect in Rome. Morone pointed out to him that he should have expressed himself clearly in favour of Philip's marriage with

¹ Pole to Julius III., April 22, 1554, in BROWN, V., n. 877; *cf.* n. 882, p. 494; ANCEL, 765.

² ANCEL, 764-5.

³ *Ibid.*, 767.

⁴ Pole to Morone, May 25, 1554, in BROWN, V., n. 882, p. 492-3. Pole's request for recall, mentioned here, was known to Morone as early as May 6, *ibid.*, n. 884, p. 497; *cf.* ANCEL, 769, n. 1.

Mary, and thus have removed all ground for suspicion. Even now he might make up for this omission by truthfully explaining to the Emperor his position with regard to the marriage.¹ The legate answered that he had always, since his arrival in Brussels, expressed himself as being in agreement with the Emperor regarding the union of Philip with Mary. The determination with which Charles and Granvelle had repulsed him could only have been greater if they had proceeded to blows.² He therefore persisted in his request for recall.

In this apparently hopeless entanglement, the relations between England and the Pope found a shrewd agent³ in the person of the nuncio in Brussels, the Archbishop of Conza, Girolamo Muzzarelli, a Dominican, on whose skill and moderation Morone had already bestowed the greatest praise.⁴ Muzzarelli understood how to induce the Emperor gradually to form a more favourable estimate of Pole, and, as early as June 10th, he was able to write to Rome that the Emperor would no longer oppose the journey of the legate to England.⁵ The actual conclusion of the Spanish marriage on July 25th, gave Pole himself the courage to come out once more from his retirement. On July 11th he sent a messenger to England with a letter of congratulation to Philip.⁶ A little later he also ventured to apply again to Charles V. and to congratulate him. The bearer of this letter, Ormanetto, had to seek the Emperor in his camp; he avoided Ormanetto's urgent requests that he would at last allow the Papal legate to fulfil his duties, by evasive answers, and declared that he must first enquire as to the state of affairs in England.⁷

Repulsed by the Emperor, the English Cardinal applied

¹ *Ibid.* 767.

² BROWN, V., n. 882, p. 492.

³ ANCEL, 769.

⁴ See in Appendix No. 21b, Morone's letter to Pole of December 21, 1553. (Corsini Library). Muzzarelli had been in Brussels since March 15.

⁵ ANCEL, 769.

⁶ BROWN, V., n. 917.

⁷ ANCEL, 770.

to King Philip on September 21st, and complained in suitable terms of this "eternal postponement" of his hopes. Who was this prelate who was kept so long standing knocking at the door? It was a man, who on account of his defence of the rights of Philip's consort to the throne, had been driven from his home and his country, and had now been eating the bread of exile for twenty years. Besides this, Pole was not begging admittance as a private individual. As Peter, when freed from his prison, had, according to the Acts of the Apostles, to stand knocking at the door of Mary, the mother of John, till it was at length opened to him, so now another Peter had to stand knocking at the door of another Mary. He could understand that she had been afraid to open to him before, but now she had the support of her husband, and the interests of the queen herself required that Peter should be allowed to enter, for her legitimacy, as well as her right, depended on the acknowledgment of the Pope.¹

On September 28th Pole repeated the same arguments in a letter to the Emperor,² which he again sent by Ormanetto. Charles, however, once more answered that the right moment had not yet come, and that he would speak further with the legate after his return.³

The audience which he had thus promised to the English Cardinal took place on October 11th at Brussels.⁴ Pole explained that two obstacles stood in the way of the return of England to the Church, namely, the errors in matters of faith, and the question of Church property. In the case of the former the Pope could not yield, but in the matter of Church property, he was prepared to make concessions. Pole did not, indeed, inform the Emperor to what extent Julius III. had already modified his claims, in the brief of September 28th, but he spoke of the powers with which the brief given him at the

¹ BROWN, V., n. 946.

² *Ibid.*, n. 947.

³ ANCEL, 770.

⁴ Pole to Julius III., October 14 (not 13), 1554, BROWN, V., n. 952. ANCEL, 784.

beginning of his legation had invested him. The Emperor answered that there was no cause for anxiety as far as the question of doctrine was concerned, as they had to deal with a people who had no firm convictions about religion at all ; as he had learned from his experiences in Germany, the whole matter resolved itself into a question of the Church property, and in this connection he desired to see the full powers of the legate, and would wait for the return of his ambassador, Erasso, before coming to any further decision.

As had been the case in this audience, Pole did not explain the full extent of his powers either to the Emperor or Mary. He had already anticipated the desire of the Emperor to see the brief of September 28th, by handing it to Granvelle before the audience, but he kept another important document a profound secret. The Pope had promised him, in a brief of August 5th, that he would always confirm and consider valid anything which his legate might do.¹ His reason for keeping this back lay in his anxiety to avoid anything in the negotiations about the return to ecclesiastical unity which might, in his opinion, be regarded as a business transaction, or the Papal concessions in the light of a bargain. The no less conscientious Muzzarelli, however, did not share Pole's views on this point. He impressed on the legate that he must, of necessity, inform the Emperor, as well as the English sovereigns, of the full extent of his powers ; they must have an exact knowledge of this, in order to be in a position to take the most suitable measures for bringing back England to the faith. In consequence of Pole's reserve, the goodwill of the Pope was called in question in Brussels as well as in London, and he was suspected of first wishing to gain the submission of England to the Holy See, and of intending then to have recourse to stern measures by demanding the return of the Church property.²

As the powers conferred by the brief of September 28th did not appear to either Philip or Charles to be sufficiently comprehensive, the Emperor enjoined his ambassador in Rome,

¹ Printed in WEISS, *Papiers de Granvelle*, IV., 70.

² ANCEL, 785.

Manrique, to request Julius III. to amplify them. People in Rome, he wrote to Manrique, appeared to think that the present possessors of the Church property thought more of their material prosperity than of the welfare of their souls, and also that they were very numerous, and that, in their endeavours to secure their property, they would make desperate attempts to stir up the people.¹ Pole, who preferred to have special powers and authorization to those contained generally in the brief of August 5th, added his request to that of the Emperor. Besides the authority conferred in the brief of September 28th, to enter into agreements and negotiations with regard to Church property, they begged that the further brief might confer the right, expressed in clear and distinct terms, of absolutely renouncing Church property, and that the clause in the former brief, to the effect that, in cases of special importance, application should be made to Rome, should be completely withdrawn.²

Before the answer to this application arrived, the last obstacles in the way of Pole's appearance in England were removed. As the steps which he had taken with regard to the Pope showed, the Emperor was now in earnest about his promise to allow the legate to fulfil the duties of his office, while Philip also wished to be a ruler in a Catholic kingdom. Mary openly declared that she was ready to give her life for the re-establishment of ecclesiastical unity.³ Two Dominicans and two Franciscans, one of whom was the learned Altonso de Castro, had come to England with Philip, and preached in London in their habits; although they had, at first, been mocked at, on this account, they soon gained great influence by their learning.⁴ It made a great impression, also, when Gardiner, on September 30th, openly acknowledged, in a sermon preached before a large congregation at St. Paul's Cross, that he had grievously erred by his co-operation in the

¹ *Ibid.* 786.

² Pole to Julius III., October 19, 1554 in BROWN, V., n. 954.

³ ANCEL, 787.

⁴ *Ibid.* 783.

schism under Henry VIII., and that his imprisonment under Edward VI. had been a just punishment for what he had done.¹

If the favourable opportunity was not to be missed, the departure of Pole for England was very urgent, for Parliament was to be opened on November 12th, and the question of reunion must then be discussed.

The Imperial ambassador in London, Simon Renard, arrived in Brussels just at the right moment, on October 20th. On the 22nd, he explained the state of affairs in England to Pole, in the presence of the nuncio.² He said that three classes of people there were opponents of reconciliation with Rome : those in whose eyes religious freedom meant the same thing as carnal freedom ; those who had been enriched by the goods of the Church ; and, finally, the ambitious, to whom risings and unrest in the country were ever welcome. The expressions in the brief of September 28th had aroused fears in England that Pole would take legal proceedings against the holders of Church property after the reunion with Rome, and demand restitution. Then Renard laid the following questions before the English Cardinal. Did he propose to make a solemn entry into London, invested with the insignia of his office as legate ? Would he exercise his powers in agreement with Mary and Philip ? Would the Pope grant him an amplification of the powers he had already received ? Pole answered that they must, above all things, cease to expect that the breach could be healed by this prolonged delay. He would make no difficulty about appearing in England as a simple Papal envoy, without the insignia of a legate, he would not hesitate to seek the advice of their Majesties in the exercise of his powers, and he had no doubt as to the readiness of the Pope to meet their wishes.

In a further meeting on October 25th, Renard again returned to the question of Church property, and the extension of the powers given him by the Pope. In order to satisfy him, Pole showed him the secret brief of August 5th, in which Julius III.

¹ *Ibid.*

² Pole to Julius III., October 23, 1554 in BROWN, V., n. 955.

had, from the first, promised his concurrence with all the decisions of the legate. Renard was exceedingly pleased and declared that if the existence of this document had been known earlier, all the recent steps which had been taken with regard to the Pope would have been unnecessary. On Renard's advice, the brief was also laid before the Emperor, who remarked in astonishment to Muzzarelli: "If the legate is not already in England, he has only himself to thank for it."¹

Pole's time, therefore, had at last arrived. His joy, as Muzzarelli wrote was "inconceivably great," and in his letters to London and Rome he expressed it in the strongest terms.² His satisfaction could only be increased by a letter from the queen, on November 6th. She informed him that she had, on the previous Saturday, announced to her Council, in a formal sitting and in the presence of her husband, that in her opinion the time had now come to summon the legate and to complete the reconciliation with Rome. All had unanimously agreed with this opinion of the queen, and two of the most influential members, Lord Paget and Lord Edward Hastings, had at once been commissioned to repair to Brussels and invite the legate to England in the name of the Royal Council.³ On November 8th the English ambassador in Brussels, John Mason, showed this official invitation to the Emperor, and on the following day, Granvelle informed the English Cardinal that it was now time to prepare for the journey to London.⁴

On November 11th Paget and Hastings presented themselves before the legate, and again at once referred to the burning question of the Church property, which now formed the only obstacle to the reconciliation of their country with the Pope.⁵ Pole had his farewell audience with the Emperor on the 12th, and on the following day he left Brussels.

¹ ANCEL, 788.

² Muzzarelli to del Monte, October 28, 1554 in ANCEL, 789. Pole to Mary, October 27, in BROWN, V., n. 958; Pole to Philip, October 27, *ibid.*, n. 959; Pole to Cardinal Morone, *ibid.*, n. 960.

³ ANCEL, 789.

⁴ Pole to Julius III., November 11, 1554, in BROWN, V., n. 962.

⁵ *Ibid.*, n. 962, p. 592.

His journey to London was like a triumphal procession.¹ On November 19th he was received at Calais, on his first entering into English territory, in the most solemn manner, by the marshall at the head of the garrison, and all the officials. When he landed at Dover he was welcomed by Lord Montague and Thirlby, the Bishop of Ely, who were accompanied by a great number of the nobility, in the name of the queen and King Philip. The further he advanced, the greater was the number of the nobles of the country who joined him, until at last 1800 gentlemen formed his retinue.

At Canterbury Pole was received with joyful acclamations by the people. From thence he sent Richard Pate, Bishop of Worcester, to their Majesties, to ask when they would grant him an audience. When he proceeded, two days later, two members of Parliament brought him the news at Gravesend that the sentence of attainder pronounced against him by Henry VIII. had been reversed by Parliament, amid cries of jubilation, in the presence of the queen and King Philip. In handing him the document which had been drawn up concerning this, the two members informed him that their Majesties desired him to appear before them as legate, wearing all the insignia of his office.

The same proposal had been made to Pole at Canterbury, but then he had declined to accept it, but now, as their Majesties wished it, he had to give way. The large silver legate's cross was affixed to the prow of the royal barge which the queen had sent to meet him at Gravesend, and the Cardinal, accompanied by a great number of vessels, which carried the greatest nobles of the land, sailed up the Thames to Westminster. There he was welcomed on landing by Gardiner, at the gate by King Philip, and at the top of the steps, which he ascended in the company of Philip, by the queen, who was radiantly happy, and declared that she had not felt such gladness on her accession to the throne.² This memorable

¹ Description of the journey in a letter of Pole to del Monte, of November 25, 1554, in the Secret Archives of the Vatican, *Inghilterra*, III., 69-70. Cf. *ANCEL*, 790 *seqq.*, *LINGARD*, 177.

² *LEE*, 346.

day was November 24th. Pole took up his temporary residence in the archiepiscopal palace at Lambeth.

The task which had brought the legate to England could only be accomplished with the help of Parliament, which had been sitting since November 12th. In the opening speech, Gardiner declared that the first Parliament of the queen's reign had restored the former religious conditions, the second had confirmed her marriage treaty, and the third was asked to bring about the union of the kingdom with the Universal Church.¹ No opposition to the royal wishes was expected, and both Houses had very willingly reversed the sentence of attainder on Pole. The manner in which the reconciliation with Rome was now to be effected in Parliament was discussed by Pole and Gardiner on November 25th. This was determined by the legate on the following day, and carried into execution, as had been already arranged, on November 28th, 29th and 30th. It happened very fortunately that, just as Pole was deliberating with the sovereigns, the Papal Bull, containing all the alterations asked for by the Cardinal, should have been delivered to him.²

On November 28th Parliament assembled in the royal palace of Whitehall. Pole was solemnly brought in and delivered a long discourse setting forth the purpose of his mission.³ He thanked them, first of all, for having, by their repeal of the act of attainder, restored to him his native land, his estates and his title of nobility. He had returned, he said, to restore to his country her title of nobility, which in the sorrowful events of the preceding decades she had forfeited. Till now, England had distinguished herself by her devotion to Christ and the Holy See ; this devotion she had fostered,

¹ LINGARD, 177.

² ANCEL, 792. The Bull was discovered by Ancel in the *Reg. Vat., 1795, p. 295. (Secret Archives of the Vatican). It bears the date August 1, 1554, so that the reconciliation of England may appear to be a result of the Queen's marriage on July 25, ANCEL, 792.

³ Contents of the speech, from a copy in the Secret Archives of the Vatican, in ANCEL, 793.

and through Boniface, had spread among other nations. She had been deprived of this great prerogative and noble title because the Holy See would not give way to a criminal passion, and because, in contradiction to their forefathers, she had gone to foreign nations in order to be indoctrinated with the abominations of their false teaching. Now, however, God had raised up a queen who would lead her country out of this house of bondage, and the two highest powers on earth, the Pope and the Emperor, had come to support her. King Philip, as the representative of the Emperor, would establish temporal peace, and he himself, as the representative of the Pope, had come to give his countrymen spiritual peace. Only two conditions were necessarily bound up with the reunion of the country with the Holy See : they must acknowledge their transgression, and they must repeal the laws against the Papal supremacy.

After this speech, Pole retired, and Gardiner continued the discussion. His exhortation to reunion with the Church was received with universal applause, and on the following day the proposal was formally voted upon and carried.

On November 30th, Parliament again assembled in the great hall of the royal palace. Philip sat at the queen's left hand, and the Cardinal on her right, but at a greater distance from the throne. Gardiner announced the decision of the previous day, and begged their Majesties to act as mediators between the representatives of the people and the legate. A petition to this effect was then read aloud, which all present loudly acclaimed, after which the queen and King Philip handed it to the legate and begged absolution for schism and all censures. Pole then caused the Bull concerning his powers and authority to be read, and gave thanks to God in a short speech for England's reconciliation. Then all, the queen and king not excepted, fell upon their knees and received absolution in the name of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost. A loud and oft repeated " Amen " resounded on all sides, and a solemn Te Deum in the royal chapel closed the proceedings.¹

Two days later, on the first Sunday in Advent, Pole made his

¹ LINGARD, 179. ANCEL, 794-5.

entry into London, amid universal enthusiasm. After Bishop Bonner had celebrated High Mass in the presence of the legate and King Philip, Gardiner preached at St. Paul's Cross on the text from the liturgy of the day: "Now is the time to arouse from sleep." He was listened to by 25,000 people. When Pole returned to the archiepiscopal palace, the people thronged round him in such crowds to receive his blessings, that Parpaglia writes that he could not have believed that London contained so many inhabitants.¹

The burning question of the Church property was finally settled immediately after the reconciliation.² Two petitions on the matter were addressed to the Crown, one from Parliament, and the other from the clergy. In the former, Parliament besought their Majesties to obtain from the legate all those dispensations which the changes during the time of schism made necessary, and they desired, in particular, that the right of possession should be assured to the present holders of Church lands. In the other petition the clergy renounced all claim on the stolen ecclesiastical property. Pole issued the desired decree on December 24th. In accordance with this, all the charitable institutions and schools founded during the schism were to remain in being, and all the marriages and episcopal "acta" concluded during this period without the necessary Papal dispensation were declared valid, while the possessors of Church property were not to be disturbed, either now or in the future, on ecclesiastical grounds. A comprehensive Bill of January 1555 then declared that all the statutes promulgated since the twentieth year of Henry VIII. against the Papal authority were invalid, and confirmed the legate's decree.

As a sign that a new era had begun and that the old troubles were forgotten, at the return of England to the Universal Church, all those who still remained in prison on account of their participation in the rebellion of Northumberland and Wyatt, were released from the Tower on January 18th, 1555.³

¹ ANCEL, 795-6.

² LINGARD, 179-182.

³ *Ibid.* 184.

Elizabeth returned to court, while Courtenay received "permission" to travel for the purpose of improving his education. He died suddenly in Venice in 1556.

Viscount Montague, Bishop Thirlby and Sir Edward Carne were appointed ambassadors to Rome on February 18th, to announce officially to the Pope the happy news of England's return to the Church.¹

Julius III. received the first news of the events of St. Andrew's Day, on December 14th, in a letter from the hand of King Philip.² The Feast of St. Andrew, to which he owed his deliverance at the sack of Rome,³ again became for him a day of rejoicing. He caused the royal letter to be read to as many Cardinals, prelates and others as the Hall of Consistory could contain, and then proceeded to St. Peter's in order to assist at a Mass of thanksgiving in St. Andrew's Chapel. Afterwards, prayers of thanksgiving for fourteen days were prescribed and a Jubilee indulgence proclaimed.⁴ The joyful events were celebrated in other parts of Italy, as well as in Rome,⁵ by solemn thanksgivings and bonfires,⁶ while pamphlets announced the great triumph in the most distant lands.⁷ The

¹ *Ibid.*

² ANCEL, 796. Nonciat. de France, I., 175. A letter of Pole of November 30, (RAYNALDUS, 1554, n. 15. BROWN, V., n. 966) only reached Rome later. An official letter of Mary and Philip of December 16, in RIBIER, II., 542.

³ *Cf. supra* p. 47.

⁴ See Acta Consist. in RAYNALDUS, 1554, n. 16; Nonciat. de France, I., 175; BECCADELLI, Monumenta, II., 315.

⁵ See PAGLIUCCHI, 126: *L'allegrezza publica et ringraziamenti fatti a Dio dalla Santità di N.S. Julio papa III. et dal sacro collegio per il ritorno del regno d'Inghilterra alla cattolica unione*, Milan, 1555. The "*Oratio in laetitia ob reconciliationem Britanniae Romae celebrata*," of U. Foglieta, dedicated to Julius III., appeared at that time in print in Rome.

⁶ *Cf. Arch. Stor. Napolit.*, II., 575. MERKLE, II., 448.

⁷ Two pamphlets adorned with the arms of the Pope and England, which were printed in Rome, must be mentioned here: 1. *Copia delle lettere del ser. Rè d'Inghilterra, del rever. Card. Polo legato della S. Sedæ Apostolica alla Santità di N.S. Julio*

auditor of the Rota, Antonio Agostini, was commissioned to present Queen Mary with the Golden Rose, her consort receiving a consecrated sword and hat of state.¹

Papa III. sopra la reduttione di quel regno alla unione della Santa madre Chiesa et obediienza della Sede Apostolica, s.l.et a. ; 2. Il felicissimo ritorno del regno d'Inghilterra alla catholica unione et alla obediencia della sede apostolica, s.l.et a. Cf. QUIRINI, V., 303 ; BECCADELLI, Monumenta, II., 313, n. 51.

¹ See RAYNALDUS, 1555, n. 2 ; PIETER, 67-68 ; BROWN, VI., 1, n. 30, 37, 66.

CHAPTER XI.

SPREAD OF CHRISTIANITY IN THE NEW WORLD.

THE Apostolic See devoted special attention to the missions in the New World during the reign of Julius III. A brief of July 20th, 1554, made an attempt to provide for the scarcity of missionaries in America, in accordance with which suitable members of the Franciscan, Dominican and Augustinian Orders could receive permission to go as missionaries to America from the Archbishop of Seville, the Bishops of Avila, the Patriarch of the West Indies, and the former Bishop of Pamplona, Antonio Fonseca, even without the sanction of the superiors of their own Order.¹ A new bishopric was founded at la Plata on June 27th, 1552, in the modern Bolivia, for Spanish South America.² Portuguese South America had always been under the jurisdiction of the Archbishop of Funchal, in Madeira, whom Clement VII. had appointed metropolitan for the whole of the Portuguese colonies.³ This arrangement was brought to an end on February 25th, 1551, and San Salvador (Bahia) was founded as a bishopric for Brazil.⁴ Soon afterwards, on June 26th, 1551, Funchal lost

¹ RAYNALDUS, 1554, n. 30.

² Acta Consist. (Consistorial Archives); cf. RAYNALDUS, 1552, n. 58; GAMS, 160. By the *brief of September 27, 1552, Thomas de S. Martino elect. de la Plata in Indiis, received authority to take four monks with him, capable of instructing in the gospel, preaching, &c. (Brev. Julii III., Arm. 41, t. 65, n. 635. Secret Archives of the Vatican).

³ Cf. Vol. X. of this work, p. 366.

⁴ Acta Consist. *loc. cit.* RAYNALDUS, 1551, n. 79. Corpo dipl. Port., VII., 2 seq. The Bull of Foundation of July 3, 1550, in

its metropolitan rights as an independent see, and became a suffragan bishopric of Lisbon.¹

The superior of the Jesuit mission in Brazil, Manoel Nobrega, had, in particular, worked, in his letters to Europe, for the establishment of a separate bishopric there. It was his opinion that only the respect felt for a bishop, and the power which he could wield, would be sufficient to improve the moral conditions of the country, of which Nobrega's letters give such a sad picture.²

For some time after his arrival, Nobrega's letters bore the stamp of joyful anticipation. In spite of their cannibalism and polygamy, the savages seemed to be easily capable of civilization. They asked for instruction in reading and writing, as well as in Christian doctrine; they came willingly to the Christian church, and behaved there like white people.³ "Nowhere in the world," wrote Nobrega on August 10th, 1549, "had such favourable prospects been opened to Christianity,"⁴ while again, on September 14th, 1551, he thought the

the *Bullarium Patronatus Portugalliae*, I., Lisbon, 1868, 177 (*cf.* MARCELLINO DA CIVEZZA, VI., 778). Concerning the establishment of the oversea Spanish and Portuguese bishoprics, *cf.* F. X. HERNAEZ, *Collección de Bulas, Breves y otros documentos relativos a la Iglesia de América y Filipinas*, II., 1 *seqq.*, 663 *seqq.*, Brussels-Paris, 1879.

¹ *Acta Consist. loc. cit.*

² *Materiaes e achêgas para a historia e geographia do Brasil*, publicados por ordem do Ministerio da Fazenda. No. 2: *Cartas do Brasil do Padre Manoel da Nobrega*, Rio de Janeiro, 1866, 50, 57. *Ibid.* 104, Nobrega names the Brazilian bishopric as a work of the Portuguese Jesuit provincial, Simon Rodriguez: "Vossa Reverendissima foi principio de tão grande bem"; *cf.* POLANCO, III., 465: "Cuius [episcopi] promotionem apud regem nostri [the Jesuits] curaverant." Nobrega also recommended the introduction of the Inquisition as a means of freeing the slaves: "o melhor remedio destas cousas seria que o Rei mandasse inquisidores ou commissarios para fazer libertar os escravos, ao menos os que são salteados." *Materiaes*, 79.

³ *Materiaes*, 48, 84.

⁴ *Ibid.* 66.

savages in Pernambuco would be easy to convert, but that he would require a larger number of priests than was at present at his disposal to continue the good work.¹ By the end of 1553, four Jesuit settlements had already been founded, in Bahia, Porto Seguro, Espirito Santo and San Vincente, to which Piratininga, the present San Paolo, was added in January, 1554.² The instruction of the Indian children, to which the missionaries zealously devoted themselves, seemed specially full of promise.³

The atrocities committed by the white people, who were for the most part deported criminals,⁴ soon destroyed these hopes. Nobrega complains⁵ that they spoke of the natives as dogs and treated them as such. They introduced slave raids (*saltos*), induced the aborigines to embark on ships under false pretences, and sailed away with them and sold them as slaves.⁶ Their owners, moreover, troubled themselves very little about the welfare of their slaves, they worked them to death and then threw them in heaps on dunghills.⁷ Frequently they took possession of the Indian women, white women having only left Europe in small numbers, and real marriages with coloured people not being considered fitting, the consequence of these conditions was a most shocking state of immorality.⁸

Here as elsewhere, the missionaries proved themselves almost the only friends of the oppressed people. They exhorted and protested in their sermons, and backed up their protests by the refusal of the Sacraments;⁹ they assembled the slaves to instruct them in Christianity,¹⁰ and wrote to the

¹ *Ibid.* 91; *cf.* 88: "Mui facil cousa é serem totos christãos, si houver muitos obrieros que os conservem em bons costumes."

² POLANCO, IV., 611.

³ *Materiaes*, 84, 88, 101.

⁴ POLANCO, V., 622.

⁵ *Materiaes*, 151.

⁶ *Ibid.* 55.

⁷ *Ibid.* 152.

⁸ *Ibid.* 54, 79.

⁹ *Ibid.* 79, 102.

¹⁰ *Ibid.* 88.

King of Portugal to send out free labourers¹ and white women.² They met with a certain amount of success, and in some cases astonishing results were obtained.³ Everything was spoilt however, as far as the immediate future was concerned, by the arrival of the bishop, upon whom such hopes had been built. Pedro Fernandez Sardinha, who reached Bahia on June 22nd, 1552,⁴ was not capable, in spite of his zeal, of filling his difficult post in a successful manner; the clergy, too, whom he had brought with him from Portugal, were the dregs of their sacred calling, and destroyed by their bad example and their indiscriminate dispensation of the Sacraments, everything which the missionaries had, with so much trouble, attained. The activities of the Jesuits among the white population in Bahia were thus quite brought to an end. Nobrega retired to some distance from the town, leaving only one missionary behind for the benefit of the children.⁵ The bishop fell into the hands of the cannibals in 1556 and was eaten by them.⁶

The Indians of the primeval forests had no fixed place of abode; it might easily happen that the missionary who instructed them would find, on his return, nothing but their burnt down village.⁷ Besides this, the different hamlets often consisted of no more than six or seven huts, and this scattered condition of the Indians greatly increased the difficulty of instructing them. Marriages worthy of the name were also almost unknown among them, and they had neither chiefs nor

¹ *Ibid.* 100.

² *Ibid.* 79; *cf.* 54.

³ *Materiaes*, 55, 77-8, 91, 148, 150. Sometimes Indians who had been seized as slaves were allowed to go free, as their captors had been refused absolution in confession (*Ibid.* 102). Female Indians preferred to suffer ill-usage than to return to a life of sin with their master (*Ibid.* 120). *Cf.* the testimony of Correa, in POLANCO, III., 463: "multos esse in illis praesidiis non utcunque, sed egregie pios ac bonos."

⁴ *Materiaes*, 94.

⁵ *Ibid.* 148-9; *cf.* 129, 144.

⁶ *Ibid.* 148, 153.

⁷ POLANCO, II., 159.

any idea of community life ; each one was king in his own hut and did as he pleased.¹

The missionaries were, therefore, convinced that until a certain amount of civilization and order had been introduced among them, there could be no question of lasting success,² and they were extremely careful in baptizing them, chiefly on this ground.³

As far as lay in their power, the missionaries themselves endeavoured to pave the way for more civilized conditions, by uniting several hamlets into one larger village, with a view to rendering the work of instruction easier, or, in accordance with the principle adopted in the later settlements, by collecting the converts into special communities.⁴ Law and order, however, could only be introduced among the Indians on a large scale, when the state lent its assistance for this purpose. Nobrega, therefore, wrote in 1554 that everything was again going to ruin among the savages in the neighbourhood of Bahia ; tribes were destroying and devouring one another in marauding expeditions, while families were living in a perpetual state of feud with each other. It was the duty of the authorities to intervene at this juncture, for the savages themselves would prefer a mild condition of dependence to the present state of affairs.⁵

The only obstacle was that the whites took little interest in the civilization of the natives. On the contrary, it was considered sound policy to encourage the dissensions among them, for the safety of the white people was based on the fact of the Indians destroying one another.⁶ Therefore they incited one tribe against the next, encouraging them in the enjoyment

¹ POLANCO, IV., 631.

² *Ibid.* IV., 631, V., 626. *Materiaes*, 131, 147.

³ POLANCO, II., 159, 382, 387, 388, 393, 725 ; III., 472 ; IV., 623 : " Nec nisi post longam probationem quemquam baptizabant " ; V., 636 : " Cum magno delectu a nostris ad eum (baptismum) admittebantur."

⁴ *Ibid.* III., 472 ; IV., 615. *Materiaes*, 56, 99.

⁵ *Materiaes*, 107.

⁶ *Ibid.* 150 *seqq.*

of human flesh, while there were not wanting even white people who shared their dreadful feasts, with a view to giving them an example.¹ The Creoles, cross-breeds between whites and Indians, also worked in direct opposition to the missionaries, by trying to make the natives who had been baptized renounce Christianity, and treating them as cowards or women² if they would not do so.

It is astonishing and worthy of all admiration that the missionaries did not lose heart under such difficulties. Living in the greatest poverty,³ hated by the rich on account of their sermons against the slave raids,⁴ hindered sometimes by the governor, who did not pay them the cost of maintenance settled on them by the king,⁵ hampered by differences of opinion with the bishop,⁶ and crushed by the consciousness that their success did not correspond to the labour it involved,⁷ they never ceased to defend the rights of humanity, in disputations and in letters to Portugal laying their complaints before the king,⁸ and all the time continuing their efforts to comfort and alleviate the miseries of the unfortunate natives, in as far as it lay in their power to do so.

As the labours of the Jesuits met, for the present, with so much opposition in the Portuguese settlements on the coast, they earnestly hoped that better prospects would open before them somewhere else.⁹ This seemed to be the case in Paraguay.¹⁰ That country had been subject to the Spaniards for years, and what the missionaries had been vainly trying to do in Brazil, namely, to establish law and order among the Indians, had been already accomplished there. The natives

¹ *Ibid.* 150; *cf.* 87.

² POLANCO, IV., 613.

³ *Ibid.* 626, 628. *Materiaes*, 102, 104.

⁴ POLANCO, III., 461.

⁵ *Ibid.* V., 623.

⁶ *Ibid.* III., 462, 465; *cf.* *Materiaes*, 104-5, 148.

⁷ POLANCO, V., 632, 638. *Materiaes*, 147, 149, 157.

⁸ *Materiaes*, 90, 98, 106.

⁹ POLANCO, II., 718; III., 456.

¹⁰ *Ibid.* III., 456-460. *Materiaes*, 131, 166, 167.

had been instructed in Christianity by travelling missionaries of the Franciscan Order, and afterwards by secular priests ; as, however, there was a great need of spiritual assistance, the Indians had repeatedly, since 1552, sent messages to the Jesuits in Brazil to come to their aid.¹ There was no want of readiness on the part of the Jesuits to grant their request, but the plan fell through on account of the opposition of the Portuguese authorities.

In 1557, with the arrival of a new governor, Men de Sà, conditions in Brazil took a more favourable turn. Men de Sà supported the missionaries in every way. He at once reunited the natives in the neighbourhood of Bahia in three large villages, each of which contained a church ; schools arose for the Indian children, while law and justice were administered among the natives in a humane manner. These efforts were not, it is true, received with any thanks by the colonists.²

While the mission on the Brazilian coast was thus preparing for its period of greatest development by a time of probation, the conversion of the Indians in Mexico was being definitely provided for.³

Fernando Cortez had been accompanied by two priests when

¹ POLANCO, III., 458 ; IV., 615, 617 ; V., 620.

² *Materiaes*, 156 *seqq.* One of the first Protestant missionary attempts also took place at this time. The Frenchman, Durand de Villegaignon, an apostate Catholic, had founded a colony in Brazil in 1550, and requested Calvin to send missionaries. These, however, declared, three months after their arrival, that they could make nothing of the savages (*Calvini Opera*, ed. G. Baum, E. Cunitz, E. Reuss, XVI., 434). Nobrega speaks of Villegaignon (*Materiaes*, 174) : “ *Estes Francezes seguiam as heresias de Allemanha, pricipalmente as de Calvino, que está em Genebra e segundo soube delles mesmos e pelos livros que lhe acharam muitos, e vinham a esta terra a semear estas herecias pelo Gentio.*”

³ JERONIMO MENDIETA (died 1604), *Historia ecclesiastica Indiana*, Mexico, 1870. MARCELLINO DA CIVEZZA, *Storia universale delle Missioni Francescane*, VI., 523-668, Prato, 1881 ; VII., 2, *ibid.* 574-882, 1891.

he first landed in the New World, and on the news of the completion of the conquest of Mexico in 1523, five Franciscans had immediately set sail for America. The actual founders of Christianity in New Spain, however, were the twelve Franciscans who, invested with the fullest powers¹ by Leo X. on April 25th, 1521, and by Adrian VI. on May 13th, 1522, entered the capital in 1524 under Martin of Valencia, who died in 1534. Cortez himself went out to meet them with a brilliant retinue, falling on his knees and kissing their hands, to the amazement of the numerous natives who had flocked to the spot, and introducing them to the chiefs as the ambassadors of heaven.²

Numerous members of the other Orders now joined this first band of Franciscan missionaries, lists of whose names are still in existence. In the years 1529 and 1530 no less than twenty-six, in 1538 thirty-one, and in 1542 eighty-six priests received the royal permission to proceed to Mexico.³ Two reports which Martin of Valencia and Juan Zumarraga sent to Europe on June 12th, 1531, telling of the success of their labours, awakened great enthusiasm in many persons for the vocation to the missionary life.⁴ According to Martin of Valencia, in 1531 there were already twenty Franciscan convents in Mexico, of which the greater number were, indeed, little more than Indian huts, but in 1555 the number of Franciscan settlements had increased to fifty, and at the close of the XVIth

¹ Paul III. amplified this authority on February 15, 1535. Printed copy of the briefs in MENDIETA, 3, 5-7 (CIVEZZA, VI., 542).

² Villagomes (MENDIETA, 3, 12) describes the scene as an eyewitness (CIVEZZA, VI., 550).

³ CIVEZZA, VI., 553-558, where an (incomplete) list of the Franciscans is given (taken from the Archivo de Indias in Seville) who were sent by the King to Mexico from 1524 to 1550.

⁴ Cf. LUDWIG SCHMITT, *Der Kölner Theologe N. Stagesyr*, Freiburg, 1896, 170 *seqq.*; N. PAULUS in *Katholik*, 1897, II., 239. The two reports (in Italian in CIVEZZA, VI., 564-568) were circulated in French and Latin translations (Toulouse, 1532, and Cologne, 1532). CIVEZZA, VI., 568, and PAULUS, *loc. cit.*, 239.

century to seventy.¹ The Franciscans were joined in 1526 by the Dominicans and in 1533 by the Augustinians. In 1528 Juan Zumarraga, chosen by Charles V., arrived in the capital of the country as bishop-elect of Mexico and protector of the Indians. He was consecrated bishop in Spain in 1532, and returned to his diocese with numerous new missionaries. As early as 1546 the city of Mexico was able to be raised to be an archbishopric, with the suffragan sees of Oaxaca, Mechoacan, Tlaxcala, Guatemala and Chiapa.²

The Franciscans in Mexico from the very beginning made the instructions of youth the chief aim of their work.³ In each of their convents great halls were erected, in which on an average 500 native boys, and sometimes as many as between 800 and 1000, received instruction in reading, writing and ecclesiastical chant. They had, especially at first, the sons of the more influential natives in view, who would later occupy the more important positions. The education of the girls was also looked after, and for this purpose pious women, mostly members of the Third Order, were brought over from Spain to act as teachers.⁴ Bishop Zumarraga, in a letter to Charles V. on December 21st, 1537, declared that it was one of the most pressing requirements of the mission that a large college for boys should be built in each diocese, and a second one for girls. The instruction given to the boys should be extended so as to include Latin grammar, while the girls should be educated from about their sixth year by nuns and pious women, and be married when they attained the age of twelve.⁵ By their zeal in the erection of schools the Franciscans must be regarded as the founders of the Mexican system of public education, for in the old Aztec kingdom instruction by means of schools was still unknown.⁶

¹ CIVEZZA, VII., 2, 488, 530.

² GAMS, 156.

³ Martino da Valenza, in CIVEZZA, VI., 565. Mendieta in *ibid.*, 552.

⁴ CIVEZZA, VI., 554, 567.

⁵ *Ibid.* VI., 630; VII., 2, 844.

⁶ JOAQUIN GARCIA ICAZBALCETA, *La instruccion publica en la ciudad de México durante el siglo XVI.*, Mexico, 1893.

A simple lay-brother, Peter of Ghent (died 1572) won special renown as an instructor of youth, teaching the children of the capital for almost fifty years. In the morning they learned reading, writing and singing, while in the afternoon he gave them lessons in Christian doctrine. He had chosen fifty of the most advanced pupils and sent them out on Sundays, two by two, so that they might fill the office of catechists to their countrymen. Peter was also one of the most influential men in Mexico, from his knowledge of building and his skill in many crafts, so that Alonso de Montufar, Zumarraga's successor in the archiepiscopal see (1551-1569) said that it was not he, but Brother Peter, who was the real bishop of Mexico. Peter of Ghent could actually have become Archbishop of Mexico, if he had not preferred to remain in his humble position.¹

While the missionaries were teaching the young people Spanish, they themselves learned the Mexican language from their pupils, and one of their chief reasons for beginning operations by the instruction of the young was that they saw in this the easiest way of acquiring the idioms of the country.²

After they had attained to sufficient proficiency in this, the conversion of the actual Aztec territory was accomplished in a comparatively short time. The heathen temples were for the most part destroyed, and the images broken. Zumarraga writes as early as 1531 that 500 temples had been cast down and 20,000 idols burned.³ Catholic chapels arose on every side, of which Peter of Ghent had already erected 100 by 1529,⁴ and to these the Indians flocked in great numbers.

¹ SERV. DIRKS, *Le Frère Pierre de Mura, sa vie et ses travaux en Mexique*, Ghent, 1878. F. KIECKENS, in *Précis hist.*, XXIX., 277 *seqq.*, Brussels, 1880. CIVEZZA, VI., 538-542, 600-603 623-626; VII., 2, 761-777.

² Mendieta describes how the missionaries took part in the childish games of the boys, noting down at once the words which fell from their lips, and gathered together in the evenings to find the most suitable Spanish expressions for the Nahuatl idioms. CIVEZZA, VI., 552.

³ *Ibid* VI., 566.

⁴ *Ibid.*, VII., 2, 770.

The capital of the country might serve as a symbol of the religious change which had taken place, for it had arisen in less than four years from the ruins of the city destroyed by Cortez, more beautiful and magnificent than before. Where the temple of the god of war had formerly stood, the cathedral, dedicated to St. Francis, now arose, into the foundations of which the broken images of the Aztec gods had been thrown. In the part of the city called Tlatelolco a second cathedral was to be found, besides which there were about thirty churches for the natives.¹

In many cases, it is true, the conversions were only superficial ; Bishop Zumarraga complains in 1537 that Indians of advanced age kept up their old superstitious customs, and relinquished their idols and habits, especially that of polygamy, most unwillingly ; the missionaries, therefore, had above all things to endeavour to confirm the youth in the Christian religion.² The learned Bernadino of Sahagún (died 1590) thought that the early missionaries had been wanting in the "wisdom of the serpent," for they had not discovered that the Indians went to the Christian church, while still retaining their old idols.³ The missionaries, however, who lived in the closest touch with the people, could not be permanently mistaken as to their mentality, and there are many reasons which explain the rapid conversion of such great masses of the natives.

The victory over the old Mexico was, in the eyes of the Indians, also a victory over the Mexican gods, and they had to explain to themselves the fact that the Spaniards were able to destroy the idols unpunished, in the same way.⁴ Besides this the old religion had been a hard yoke for those of the lower classes. The blood of their own children was sometimes demanded of them, and the prospect of immortality was held

¹ W. H. PRESCOTT, *History of the Conquest of Mexico*, 7, 2, London, 1854 ; II., 266.

² CIVEZZA VII., 2, 844.

³ C. CRIVELLI in the *Catholic Encyclopaedia*, X., 255, New York, s.a. [1911].

⁴ PRESCOTT, 2, 4, 8 ; 5, 2 (I., 149, 195-6 ; II., 47-8).

out to them, not as a state which would depend on their moral conduct, but rather on their rank in life, or the manner of their death. The contrast between the arrogant Mexican priests, who considered themselves far above the common people, and the simple unselfish Franciscans could not fail to bring out the superiority of the missionaries. It made a great impression on the Indians, that the religious went about barefoot, and were content with as poor nourishment as they had themselves.¹ Of still greater weight was the fact that the missionaries showed a comprehension of the needs of the poor natives, and defended and protected them whenever they could. That the conquerors, whom they looked up to as "white gods" should so reverence these poor missionaries, increased still more the esteem in which they held them.² The national place of pilgrimage, Guadalupe, had also a great influence on the conversion of the Indians; they were firmly convinced that Our Lady had appeared in 1531 to one of their own people there, and had left her picture painted on an Indian cloak, as a palpable proof that the Christian religion was not for the white man alone.

The greatest obstacle to the christianizing of Mexico came, here as elsewhere, from the whites. "The Indians," writes Peter of Ghent on February 15th, 1552,³ to the Emperor, "are overwhelmed with work and cannot earn enough to live. They must perform compulsory labour for their masters for a whole month, perhaps at a distance of forty or fifty miles from their homes, and are not, during that time, able to till their own fields, and when they return to their huts they find their wives and children in misery, with hardly enough to cover them, and their little property has then to be sold to provide them with the means of existence." As a consequence of this, the Indian population began to die out. On March 8th, 1594, the missionaries wrote to the Spanish government that the tax-paying Indians had diminished by 300,000 in seven years, and that without any pestilence.⁴

¹ Motolinia in CIVEZZA, VII., 2,874.

² Mendieta in CIVEZZA, VI., 550 *seqq.*

³ CIVEZZA, VI., 600 *seqq.*

⁴ *Ibid.* VII., 2, 871.

The Spanish government cannot be blamed altogether for this state of affairs. A great many royal regulations were issued in favour of the natives of Mexico,¹ and the first viceroys, Mendoza and Velasco, also showed much good will. The work in the mines by the Indians, was, for example, abolished by Velasco, who said that the freedom of the Indians was of more value than all the mines in the world, and that all human and divine laws could not be trampled underfoot for the sake of profit.² In consequence, the condition of the natives really did improve ; they won more and more freedom, were able to do their work as they desired, and, except in the towns on the coast, actual slavery never seems to have gained a firm footing in Mexico.³ They were not condemned to extinction, as in so many other colonies ; among the thirteen and a half millions of inhabitants of Mexico to-day, there are little more than two million white people, the others being, with the exception of 80,000 negroes, all Indians or Mestizoes.

But, in the early times after the conquest, and especially in the years when no viceroy ruled in Mexico, and the country was under an " Audiencia " or Court of Justice, the condition of the natives was indeed unbearable. The good will of the viceroy was not able to cope with the force of prevailing circumstances, and nobody in Mexico troubled much about laws which had been made in Spain.⁴ In the struggle against these evils the Franciscans rendered services both to Mexico and to humanity which cannot be too highly esteemed. They never ceased to preach against the oppression of the defenceless, and addressed complaint after complaint to Spain. On this account they were calumniated, alms were refused to them, the Indians were taught to be suspicious of them, and their correspondence with Spain was watched. They succeeded,

¹ List in *ibid.* VI., 613.

² *Ibid.* VI., 610.

³ J. SAUMAREZ MANN in the *Encyclopædia Britannica*, XVIII., 11th Ed. 337, Cambridge, 1911.

⁴ Rodrigo de Albornoz to Charles V. on December 15, 1555, in *CIVEZZA*, VI., 608.

however, by seizing favourable opportunities, in getting their letters of complaint through to Spain, with the result that the “ Audiencia ” was abolished, and another court, favourable to the Franciscans, was set up in its place.¹

It was, above all, Bishop Zumarraga who carried on the struggle against the “ Audiencia ” and later on, after he had been, on February 24th, 1528, together with the Dominican, Julian Garces, first Bishop of Tlaxcala, appointed “ Protector of the Indians,” he did not cease to enter the lists on behalf of his clients.² The Franciscans, Motolinia (died 1569) and Mendieta (died 1604) were also the champions of freedom for the Indians.³ The provincials of all the Orders working in Mexico addressed a joint petition to Philip II. in 1562, begging him to avert the ruin which threatened the new Church in Mexico.⁴ Indeed, it was the belief of many people in the country that the Indians there would have been exterminated, as were those of the Antilles and elsewhere, had it not been for the determination of the Franciscans.⁵

As in the actual territory of the Aztecs, the Franciscans also spread the faith in the neighbouring countries. They went very early to Mechoacan, which was able to be formed into a separate province of the Order with fifty convents in 1575.⁶ They had a great deal to suffer in Yucatan, where the Spaniards endeavoured in every way to prevent the christianizing of the natives, but in spite of this some thirty-seven mission centres

¹ Mendieta in CIVEZZA, VI., 614-615.

² In the struggle with the “ Audiencia ” he went so far as to let his Franciscans preach openly and in the plainest terms against its members (CIVEZZA, VII., 2, 622). A letter of complaint of Zumarraga of August 2nd, 1529, which demanded the deposition of the “ Auditores ” Matienzo and Delgadillo, and the severe punishment of the president, Guzman, *ibid.* VI., 613.

³ CIVEZZA, VII., 2, 622 *seqq.*, 854 *seqq.* CRIVELLI in the Catholic Encyclopædia, X., 185-6, 601-2.

⁴ CIVEZZA, VII., 2, 854.

⁵ *Ibid.* 875.

⁶ *Ibid.* VI., 643.

were founded between 1534 and 1600.¹ The Franciscans began their work in Guatemala in 1539;² in the year 1603 they had already twenty-four convents,³ while Nicaragua and Costa Rica formed an independent province in 1579, with twelve settlements. They had been working among the savage tribes of Zacatecas since 1546 at least,⁴ and suffered much persecution there, not a few of them losing their lives.⁵

In Guatemala the Dominicans had preceded the Franciscans in 1538. Under the guidance of Dominic of Betanzos their sphere of activity was also extended over many provinces. They had three large convents, in the capital of the country, in Oaxaca and Puebla, besides twenty-two settlements in Mexico proper, twenty-one in the territory of the Zapotecas, seventeen among the Mixtecas, as well as one in Vera Cruz and another in S. Juan d'Uloa.⁶ They were specially active in Nicaragua, as well as in Guatemala.⁷ To the north of Guatemala there was a tract of land named Terra de Guerra, so called on account of the savagery of the inhabitants and the vain attempts which had been made to subdue it. When Las Casas' book concerning the conversion of the Indians was written, many Spaniards scornfully challenged the Dominicans to attempt in this country the use of the purely peaceful means of conversion advocated by the member of their Order. The Dominicans accepted the challenge, and they succeeded, without the support of armed power, in gaining an entrance

¹ *Ibid.* VII., 2, 511. In the last quarter of the XVIth century, the mission was partly given over to secular priests. A list of the parishes given up and of those retained *ibid.* 523-527.

² *Ibid.* VI. 646-7.

³ List in *ibid.* VII. 2, 538-541.

⁴ *Ibid.* 545-6.

⁵ *Ibid.* 552. Zacatecas appears as an independent province of the Order in 1604; it had then 16 convents, a number which had risen to 35 by 1733. List in *ibid.* 551-2.

⁶ TOURON, O.P. *Histoire générale de l'Amerique*, V., and VI., Paris, 1768. Names of the first missionaries, *ibid.* V., 36-7, 186-7. For the convents *cf.* V., 106.

⁷ TOURON, V., 194-5.

into the country and in changing the former "land of war" into the present day Vera Paz. Royal decrees assured the freedom of the converted Indians.¹

Among the Dominican bishops, Julian Garces, first Bishop of Tlaxcala, was, together with Las Casas, a zealous champion of the Indians, as well as their defender. He addressed a memorandum to Paul III., calling on the authority of the Holy See itself against those who would deny to the Indians all power of being received as members of the Christian body.² In this he represents in glowing terms, the good moral behaviour of his protégés. Paul III. answered this memorandum by his celebrated brief against slavery.³

The zealous labours of the missionaries in Mexico also bore great fruit in the advancement of learning. The science of languages has absolutely no other source of information with regard to the ancient languages of Mexico than their researches. Two of the first Franciscans, Alonso Molina and Bernardino de Sahagún had mastered all the intricacies of the prevailing language of the country, the Aztec. Molina composed a dictionary and grammar of Aztec, and we may specially mention Sahagún's translation of the Epistles and Gospels into classical Aztec.⁴ Franciscans and Dominicans in the XVIth century also composed dictionaries and grammars of the other languages of Mexico, Miztec, Zapotec, Maya and a number of other dialects, which were in part printed at the time, for use in spreading the faith.⁵

The necessity of gaining a knowledge of the ideas and customs of the Aztecs, also led to the study of the antiquities of this remarkable people. Bernardino de Sahagún succeeded, after the most exhaustive and diligent study, in providing data which are acknowledged to be the most complete which are to

¹ *Ibid.* 266 *seqq.* Copy of the decree, *ibid.* 286.

² *Ibid.* 137 *seqq.*

³ Cf. Vol. XII. of this work, p. 519 *seq.*

⁴ *Evangeliarium, Epistolarium et Lectionarium Aztecum sive Mexicanum* (1563). Published by Bernardino Biondelli, 1858.

⁵ Jos. DAHLMANN, *Die Sprachkunde und die Missionen*, Freiburg, 1891, 90 *seqq.* Mendieta in CIVEZZA, VII., 732 *seqq.*

be obtained in this field of research.¹ A work, planned on a very large scale, which deals with the antiquities of Mexico from heathen times, as well as with its ecclesiastical history, was composed by Juan de Torquemada,² the "Livy of New Spain." The same subject was treated by Toribio de Benavente, one of the twelve missionaries who came to Mexico in 1524.³ He was greeted at the time by the Indians with the name of "Motolinia," which means "poor," on account of his poverty-stricken appearance, and from that he always made use of the name. In his fight for the freedom of the Indians he was keenly opposed to Las Casas, whose ideas seemed to him exaggerated. Jerónimo de Mendieta deals in his Indian ecclesiastical history with the christianizing of Mexico. Almost everything that we know concerning ancient Mexico and its wonderful civilization can be directly traced to these historical works of the Franciscans, which, for the most part, were only published during the XIXth century.

¹ BERNARDINO DE SAHAGÚN, *Historia general de las cosas de Nueva España*, published by Bustamente, Mexico, 1829, by Lord Kingsborough, London, 1830; French translation, Paris, 1880.

² Entered the Franciscan Order in 1583 in Mexico, and died there in 1624. His work, *Monarquía Indiana*, appeared first in Seville in 1615, in Madrid in 1723.

³ TORIBIO MOTOLINIA, *Historia de los Indios en la Nueva España, o Ritos antiguos, sacrificios e, idolatrias de los Indios de la Nueva España y de su conversion a la fé, y quienses fueron los que primero la predicaron*; published by Lord Kingsborough, London, 1848, in Mexico, by J. G. Icazbalceta, Mexico, 1858.

CHAPTER XII.

THE EAST INDIES AND THE MISSION OF SAINT FRANCIS XAVIER.

IN the East Indies, the work of the missions was not greatly developed under Julius III., although it gained a firmer footing and struck deeper roots. "We are not yet troubling," writes the Jesuit, Melchior Núñez, on December 7th, 1552, from Bassein,"¹ to make many Christians. Those whom we gain we first and above all things thoroughly instruct, and make it our chief endeavour to retain those already won over to the faith and to teach them, for up to the present matters have been very serious in this respect."

On the first arrival of the Portuguese in India, rough soldiers had endeavoured, in their own way, to assist in the spreading of Christianity by immediately baptizing the native prisoners of war. Priests, too, had been in the habit of administering baptism in the same "military" way.² There were, happily, exceptions, and Núñez speaks of the Franciscan, Antonio do Porto, who took great pains with the instruction of the new converts, as being one of these.³ Fra Antonio is known to have not only destroyed temples and erected churches, but also to have founded several institutions for the education of orphan boys.⁴ It was not the same everywhere, however. The vicar of Goa, had, according to his own testimony, baptized no fewer than 120,000 heathens on the Fishing Coast in three years, and often from 1000 to 1500 a day.⁵ Yet all these

¹ *Selectae Indiarum Epistolae*, 165; cf. 145, 182.

² Expression of POLANCO (II., 145, n. 343).

³ *Sel. Ind. Epist.*, 165.

⁴ MULLBAUER, 56, 327.

⁵ POLANCO, II., 145.

had, as Francis Xavier wrote in 1542, nothing of Christianity about them but the name.¹

Francis Xavier had recognized from the first that the principal work to be done lay in the instruction of the new converts, and he, therefore, laid the greatest stress on this point. He did not, by any means, bring a cut and dried scheme with him from Europe for the furtherance of this object, for we find him, in 1542, earnestly begging, in a letter from India, the advice of his colleagues in Rome, as to how he had better proceed with his missionary work.² He also, at first, administered baptism immediately after the most essential lessons had been given, leaving further instruction for the future.

Experience, however, soon showed that much more care must be exercised, as so many begged to be received into the Church from merely human motives.³ These nominal Christians afterwards either refused to listen to instruction, or eventually returned to the worship of their idols and to their heathen customs. The Jesuits, therefore, instituted a catechumenate of from three to four months, and those who were found to be insincere were sternly sent away.⁴

Ignatius of Loyola had given twofold advice for the purpose of confirming Christianity in India : first, the instruction of the children must be provided for, and, secondly, houses for the instruction of the catechumens must be established for the adults.⁵ His advice was joyfully followed by the Jesuits in India. The principal care of Francis Xavier was to gather the

¹ To Ignatius, October 28, 1542 : Mon. Xav., I., 273. Anton Criminalis S. J. referred his conversation with Diego de Borba to the authority of the theologians who declared a catechumenate of several months to be necessary. De Borba endeavoured, in spite of this, to defend the practice of immediate baptism, by pointing out the peculiar Indian conditions. See BROU in the *Études*, CXXVIII. (1911), 603 *seqq.*

² September 20, 1542 : Mon. Xav., I., 259.

³ Nic. Lancilotti describes this drastically in a letter to Ignatius of October 10, 1547 : Sel. Ind. Epist., 25.

⁴ POLANCO, II., 146, n. 344.

⁵ *Ibid.* 145, n. 343.

children together in the first place, and through them influence the parents ; he introduced this method of procedure throughout the whole of India.¹ At a period when instruction was nowhere given to foreigners in the Jesuit colleges in Europe, schools² arose everywhere in India where the Jesuits were to be found, in which the native children were taught reading, writing and catechism.³ It was not, at first, possible to build houses for catechumens in each place, but, in 1555, several rooms were set apart in the college of Goa, where from twelve to fifteen catechumens were constantly receiving instruction, which lasted for two or three months. Female catechumens received the necessary instruction under the supervision of a respectable matron in the hospital.⁴

Further progress was made, especially by Henrico Henriquez,⁵ to whom it was of great advantage in his mission on the Fishing Coast, that all the natives belonged to the same tribe, and that the whole population, as such, had embraced Christianity.⁶ To make up, to some extent, for the want of priests, Henriquez introduced a system of instruction given by catechists. He chose the most gifted among the new converts, and appointed them to give Christian instruction in the various villages, and in cases of necessity to baptize, while serious offences were to be brought to the knowledge of the missionaries. As Henriquez was very careful in choosing his catechists, their number did not exceed nine or ten ; they discharged their duties to the complete satisfaction of the missionaries, so that Henriquez thought that, should the priests all die, Christianity might still be maintained by these catechists on the Fishing Coast. A trustworthy man was also appointed in each village, who held meetings for prayer, and gave religious instruction in the native tongue.⁷ The new

¹ *Ibid.* V., 656, n. 1805 ; 670, n. 1849.

² *Ibid.* II., 5.

³ POLANCO, V., 659, n. 1813.

⁴ *Ibid.* II., 652, n. 1789 ; V., 659, n. 1814. Sel. Ind. Epist., 182.

⁵ Sel. Ind. Epist., 140-1. POLANCO, II., 141, 406.

⁶ POLANCO, II., 406, n. 486.

⁷ *Ibid.* 141-2, 406.

converts learned the usual prayers in Latin, according to the Roman custom, although Henriquez soon allowed them much liberty in this respect.¹

A further praiseworthy practice of Henriquez and his companions lay in the fact that they earnestly devoted themselves to the study of the language of the country.² The first Jesuit missionaries, who found themselves confronted by a multiplicity of native dialects, and did not wish to confine their activities to limited districts, had to make use of an interpreter for their sermons. With these, however, they often had unpleasant experiences. When Henriquez understood Tamil better, he found many mistakes made by the interpreter in the translation of the ordinary prayers.³ The new translation, as he wrote to Rome, cost him from three to four months hard work, as no words existed in the language for Christian ideas. He reported this so that the missionaries on the Congo might be warned; they should not attempt the translation of the prayers until they had a thorough command of the language. Nicholas Lancilotti also said frequently in his letters to Ignatius that the missionaries in India should have special districts assigned to them for their labours, and should be strictly enjoined to master the language of the country. Little confidence could be placed in interpreters, and Henriquez owed his success in great measure to the fact that he had thoroughly learned the language of the natives.⁴ It was Henriquez who drew up the first Tamil grammar, which he printed for the use of the missionaries.⁵

The Portuguese officials formed the greatest obstacle in the way of the advancement of the mission. Xavier had already written to Rodriguez in Portugal, telling him that he should

¹ *Ibid.* 406.

² Henriquez to Ignatius on October 31, 1548, and November 21, 1549, in CROS, Francis Xavier, I., 387-8, and in Sel. Ind. Epist., 93; cf. POLANCO, I., 351 *seqq.*, 472; II., 142, 407.

³ Sel. Ind. Epist., 94. Francis Xavier had already found such in the Malabar translations (Mon. Xav., I., 317).

⁴ Letter of October 29, 1552: Sel. Ind. Epist., 140.

⁵ J. DAHLMANN, *Die Sprachkunde und die Missionen*, 10.

never agree to any of his friends being sent to India as an official ; however upright a man might be at home, they all fell into dishonourable ways in India.¹ A post in India was considered as much a reward for services rendered as an easy way of making money ; the native tribes who had both embraced Christianity and submitted to the Portuguese rule, were especially plundered in the most ruthless manner. It had already happened, writes a missionary from the Fishing Coast in 1555,² that an official with a salary of 2000 or 3000 ducats, had in the course of one or two years gathered together from 100,000 to 200,000 ducats of the royal revenue, by extortion from the poor pearl fishers. Such people were, naturally, hostile to the missionaries, as the protectors of the poor, did not pay them the sums the king had appointed for them, and raised obstacles in their way whenever they could.³ Lancilotti also wrote from the Fishing Coast, that it was hardly possible to describe the ruin they caused ; all that the missionaries had taken many years to bring about, was destroyed in a few months by their avarice, and there was a real danger lest the whole of the 70,000 Christians on this coast should fall away through their behaviour.⁴ Francis Xavier therefore wrote to John III. that he would “ flee ” to Japan, so as not to lose his time in India ; it was a “ martyrdom ” to see everything destroyed which had been built up with so much trouble.⁵ Henriquez also was of opinion that with a good official, much more would be gained in the matter of the conversion of the natives with a single priest, than with twenty under a bad one.⁶

The immorality of the Portuguese was almost a greater obstacle to the spread of Christianity than their avarice. Alfonso Cyprian, for example, writes from S. Thomé that the ecclesiastical as well as the secular authorities conducted

¹ Mon. Xav., I., 375.

² POLANCO, V., 671-2.

³ *Ibid.* 650, 674.

⁴ *Ibid.* 679. Sel. Ind. Epist., 199-200.

⁵ From Kotschin on January 26, 1549 : Mon. Xav., I., 510.

⁶ POLANCO, VI., 800, n. 3429.

themselves in such a manner that it was a scandal to the natives when the Europeans led such lives ; the new converts fell away again, while others refused baptism when they saw the abandoned way in which Christians lived.¹ It is true that S. Thomé, which lay on the extreme borders of the Portuguese territory, had become a place of refuge for all those who dared not live elsewhere. Similar complaints were also heard, however, from other parts of India.² The ease with which slaves could be procured in India furthered the general immorality in a special way.³ Rich Portuguese possessed as many as 300 or more,⁴ so that it was, in many cases, possible for them to have regular harems of twenty or more slaves.⁵

To all this was added the invasion of southern India by Islam, in which the missionaries not only found a powerful rival, concerning whose progress the Jesuits often complained,⁶ but also a dangerous enemy. In a petition to King John III. the missionaries relate that in 1554 the Arabs had caused the loss of two Christian missions in Travancore, by inducing the king, with presents of money, to forbid the Christian priests to preach or build churches.⁷ The new converts, especially in the Moluccas, where the natives had eagerly embraced Christianity, suffered from the attacks of Saracen pirates. Many Christians were murdered or plundered, others being thrown into the sea if no one offered to buy them, while many Christian villages were burned to the ground.⁸

As they had done in the East Indies, so did the Jesuits penetrate into Abyssinia as the pioneers of the Church. The hope of again being able to reunite the Abyssinian Church with

¹ *Ibid.* V., 683.

² VALIGNANI, *Historia del principio y progreso de la Compañía de Jesús en las Indias orientales*, I., 7 (Mon. Xav., I., 39).

³ POLANCO, II., 147, n. 345.

⁴ *Ibid.* 658, n. 1810.

⁵ *Ibid.* II., 147, n. 345.

⁶ Lancelotti in POLANCO, V., 678, n. 1876. F. Perez in the *Sel. Ind. Epist.* 75.

⁷ *Sel. Ind. Epist.*, 198.

⁸ POLANCO, IV., 668.

Rome had first arisen under Paul III.,¹ and was still entertained under Julius III. As of old, the Holy See again made use of the mediation of Portugal. At the beginning of the year 1555 the Pope thought he was able to take a decisive step ; in consideration of the distance of the country, he appointed, on January 23rd, three bishops chosen from the Society of Jesus ; of these he fixed on Nuñez Barreto as patriarch, and Fathers Andreas Oviedo and Melchior Carnero as assistant bishops with the right of succession.² His Holiness hoped all the more for the success of this attempt as he had succeeded in 1553 in bringing about the reunion of the Nestorians in Mesopotamia.³

¹ Cf. Vol. XII. of this work p. 112 *seq.*

² See Acta Consist. in RAYNALDUS, 1555, n. 10 ; cf. *ibid.* 1554, n. 25 *seqq.* ; BECCARI, X., 39 *seqq.*, Mon. Ign. Ser., VIII., 460 *seqq.* The departure of the three bishops was delayed by the death of Julius III. ; they then took with them a letter of Paul IV. of March 10, 1556, to the Negus Claudius (see BECCARI, X., 52 *seq.*) The instructions of Ignatius in the Mon. Ign. Ser. I, VIII., 676 *seqq.* The new Patriarch sent the Jesuit, Gonzalo Rodriguez from Goa in advance, who encountered in the meanwhile (see his letter of September 13, 1556, in BECCARI, V., 358 *seqq.*) unexpected difficulties. When Oviedo finally reached Abyssinia in the spring of 1557, he could accomplish nothing for the union, owing to the attitude of the Negus Asnaf Sagad. The Negus Adamas Sagad, who succeeded in 1559, forbade the preaching of the Catholic religion, and arrested the bishop. After his death in 1563, Oviedo was set free ; he devoted himself to the spiritual care of the Portuguese kept in imprisonment in Abyssinia, and persevered there, in the most difficult conditions, until his death in 1577 (see BECCARI, X., 196-7, 209-210 ; ASTRAIN, II., 389) although Pius V. had allowed him on February 5th, 1566, to proceed as bishop to Japan ; see BECCARI, V., 424-5.

³ Cf. for the journey to Rome of the chosen "Catholicos," Sulaka and the foundation of the united Chaldean patriarchate of Mosul, besides RAYNALDUS, 1553, n. 42 *seqq.*, the reports in the periodical "Bessarione" 1898 and 1901, also "Oriens Christianus," 1906, 261 *seqq.* In both essays the Portuguese report in the Corpo dipl. Port., VII., 311-312, has been over-

What hopes Julius III. placed in the Jesuits for the conversion of the East, may best be understood from the fact that he gave them permission, by a Bull of October 6th, 1553, to found three colleges, one in Jerusalem, a second in Cyprus, and a third in Constantinople.¹ These establishments, which might have become of the greatest importance, never came into existence, but, on the other hand, Julius III. lived to see the beginning of the mission in far-off Japan. To this island kingdom, possessed of a scenery of indescribable beauty, Providence now sent a man who must be counted one of the most heroic pioneers of the religion of the Cross.

Filled with a burning zeal for the spread of the doctrines of Christianity, the Apostle of India, Francis Xavier, had proceeded, in the last year of the pontificate of the Farnese Pope, to Japan, where he landed in Kagoschima on August 15th.² On November 5th, 1549, he sent his first impressions and experiences in an exhortation to his fellow-workers. "The greatest trials you have until now endured are small in comparison with those you will experience in Japan. Prepare yourselves for difficulties, by setting aside all consideration for your own interests."³

looked. Cf. also the **relatio eorum quae gesserunt nuntii missi a Julio III. in partibus Orientis*, in the Cod. Vat. 3933, p. 73-75, of the Vatican Library. The patriarch of Armenia had been in Rome in 1550; see **Passus pro Stephano patriarcha Armen. cathol. Roma revertente*, dat. 1550, April 23, in the Arm. 41, t. 55, n. 345; cf. *ibid.* n. 363: **Imperatori* (recommendation of the patriarch of Armenia on his return home, dated April 25, 1550); t. 64, n. 355: **Passport for the Armenian Messichi*, who came from Tauris to Rome, remained there for a time and shall remain still longer, dat. May 24, 1552. The ***letter of instructions of Julius III. to Ignatius, patriarch of Antioch*, is also noteworthy (cf. CIACONIUS, III., 747), of May 26, 1553, *loc. cit.*, t. 68, n. 385.

¹ See the Bull (the only copy) contained in the Rossiana Library, Vienna, in the *Études*, LXX., 75 *seqq.* (1897).

² Cf. Vol. XII. of this work, p. 119 *seqq.*

³ Mon. Xav., I., 584-5.

The Europeans in Japan really felt as if they had come into a new world. All the habits, customs and forms of courtesy were different, the food was scanty and unusual, and the language was difficult. A missionary wrote later that one must again become a child in Japan, and learn once more how to speak, sit down, walk and eat.¹ Instead of the respect which the Portuguese had paid to the priests, the missionaries found the opposite here, because, with all their ceremonious politeness to one another, the Japanese felt nothing but contempt for strangers, especially when they, as was the case with these messengers of the faith, appeared in poor apparel.

Political conditions, moreover, were not favourable to the spread of Christianity, as the country was in a state of anarchy. Japan was nominally under the dominion of the Emperor and his representative, the Schogun, but both of them were, as a matter of fact, completely powerless.² The actual power was in the hands of more than sixty petty princes, the Daimios, who waged perpetual civil war on each other. The well organized Buddhist monasteries, which were well provided with armed forces, had great political influence, perhaps the greatest in the country, and that these would soon attack Christianity, "and not in words alone," Xavier recognized from the first.³

It was fortunate for the missionaries that the Daimios were exceedingly anxious to attract Portuguese ships to their harbours, and hoped to gain this end by protecting the missionaries. It was also favourable to the spread of Christianity that there was no single central government and no universal religion. The dominant form of religion was Buddhism, which was divided into some six opposing sects.⁴ Xavier was, however, more filled with confident expectations by the lively

¹ VALIGNANI in the *Mon. Xav.*, I., 110.

² More details concerning political conditions in JAMES MURDOCH (in collaboration with Isoh. Yamagata), *A History of Japan during the century of early foreign intercourse (1542-1651)*, Kobe (Japan), 1903, 15-17; H. HAAS, *Geschichte des Christentums in Japan*, I., 96-105, Tokio, 1902.

³ *Mon. Xav.*, I., 594.

⁴ HAAS, I., 122 *seqq.*

interest which the Japanese took in religion, and by their character, which disposed them to be influenced by arguments founded on reason, than by any other circumstances. "If God, our Lord," he writes, "gives us ten years of life, we shall see great things in this country."¹

Soon after his arrival in Kagoschima, Xavier began, with the help of his companion, Paul Anjiro, to draw up a summary of Christian doctrine in the Japanese language. As, however, Anjiro did not know the language sufficiently well, the work was not a success, and educated Japanese laughed at it.² Mockery and laughter also were not wanting when Francis, after some time, produced his work in the public streets and began to read it aloud. Nevertheless, the whole bearing of the missionary, the thought that he had come so far only to promote the salvation of a foreign race, and the sublimity of the doctrine which shone through the imperfectly expressed language, gradually made a powerful impression. After the lapse of a year, 100 Christians could be counted in Kagoschima, while the throng round the missionaries was so great that the bonzes obtained from the Daimio a prohibition of further conversions. Francis then repaired to Hirado, an island to the west of Kiuschiu, where Portuguese ships had put in.³ After very promising beginnings, however, he left this mission to his companion, Cosmas de Torres, and himself proceeded to the largest of the Japanese islands, Nippon.

It had been Xavier's plan, from the very first, to get as far as the capital of the country, Meaco, the present Kioto, and to penetrate into the presence of the Emperor, in order to obtain from him the permission to preach. After being driven out of Kagoschima, he determined no longer to postpone the carrying out of this plan. He left Hirado at the beginning of October,

¹ Mon. Xav., I., 599.

² The opinion of the later missionaries in Valignani's *Historia* (Mon. Xav., I., 119).

³ The report that Xavier said that at that time, neither he nor his companion, Juan Fernandez, understood Japanese, arises from a misunderstanding; see KNELLER in the *Zeitschrift für Kath. Theologie*, XXXV., 581 *seqq.* (1911).

1550, and spent a considerable time in Yamaguchi in Nippon, going on from thence in the middle of December to Meaco; he left this town in February, 1551, in order to return to Hirado. At the most trying time of the year, insufficiently clad, and often barefoot, in the company of the lay-brother, Fernandez, he accomplished an exceedingly difficult journey through the snow-covered country. The travellers often sank to their knees in the snow in the bad roads, and often had to plunge into icy streams to their waists. In the villages they were mocked and laughed at by the people who flocked round them in crowds, and stoned by the children, while in the inns at night they found nothing but a mat and a wooden Japanese pillow, that is to say, if, in their miserable clothing, they were received in the inns at all.

This painful pilgrimage was, moreover, almost without result, as far as their main object was concerned. In Yamaguchi, indeed, Francis was allowed to read his book even to the Daimio for about an hour, but there were no conversions. Nothing could be done in Meaco, on account of the state of war prevailing there, and Francis could only have thought of an interview with the Emperor, because he did not understand the conditions in Japan.¹

At all events, he brought back one important realization from his journey. He now knew that the Emperor was a mere shadow, who could not vie with the Daimio of Yamaguchi in real power. He had also learned that the poverty and meanness of his appearance was an obstacle to the spread of the Gospel. He therefore resolved to dress better, and to offer the presents which he had brought from India for the Emperor to the ruler of Yamaguchi, Ouchi Yoschitaka. He was received in a friendly manner by the latter, who gave him, as a return gift, an old bonze house, with the permission to preach

¹ Concerning the details of the journey we have information from Xavier's companion, the lay-brother, Fernandez, from whose lips L. Froes and others noted them down. Cf. CROS, II., 99-125.

the Gospel freely.¹ The preaching, moreover, was not **unsuccessful** ; in five or six months, they had from five to six hundred baptisms. Xavier's most important conquest was a half-blind actor who was baptized in the name of Lawrence, and was afterwards received as a lay-brother into the Society of Jesus ; in countless sermons and disputations he won thousands for Christianity, among others several Daimios.

Still more favourable prospects were opened to the messengers of the faith by the Daimio of Bungo, Otomo Yoschischige, who invited Francis to go to him at Funai and promised every support to the missionaries.

In the meantime, circumstances had arisen in India, which made the presence of Francis necessary.² He therefore returned to Goa in November, 1551, with the intention of endeavouring to introduce Christianity into China, as soon as the troubles in India were settled.

Francis Xavier had long been persuaded that if Christianity was to gain a firm footing in Asia, this, the largest and most important country of the continent, must, above all others, be won over to the faith. He had, therefore, resolved to present himself before the Emperor of Japan in Meaco, in order to obtain from him a passport for China.³ He had been able to convince himself in his discussions with the Japanese of the respect felt for Chinese learning and wisdom in Eastern Asia, for his arguments were often met with the rejoinder that it was difficult to believe that the Christian doctrine contained the truth, since it was unknown to the Chinese.⁴ On the other hand, however, he was fully aware of the difficulty of his

¹ "Mandou polas ruas da cidade *poor scriptos* em seu nome, que ele folgava que a ley de Deus se prégase em suas terras, e que ele daua, liçença que os que a quisessem tomar a tomasem." Mon. Xav., I., 683.

² Cf. CROS, II., 179-190. The fact that Xavier did not leave Japan because he despaired of winning the country for Christianity, is shown in detail, in opposition to the opinion of most Protestant writers, by HAAS, *loc. cit. supra*, II., 1-12, Tokio, 1904.

³ Mon. Xav., I., 599 ; cf. 644.

⁴ *Ibid.* 684.

undertaking. Foreigners were strictly forbidden to enter Chinese territory ; even the Portuguese who were shipwrecked on the Chinese coasts, were loaded with chains and cast into prison for years, while death might easily follow the punishment of the bastinado inflicted by the mandarins. All this, however, did not intimidate Xavier. At first he had hoped to penetrate into China as the companion of a Portuguese envoy, his own friend, Pereira, but this plan was frustrated by the opposition of the commandant of Malacca, Alvaro de Ataide, who retained Pereira there on the pretext that he was required for an expected siege of the town.

Then Xavier determined to carry out his plan alone, and, if necessary, to bear patiently the severity of the Chinese laws ; he may have thought that no other course was open to him during the lifetime of Alvaro.¹ " I am journeying," he writes, " deprived of all human protection, to the island of Canton, in the hope that a friendly heathen will take me over to the continent of China."²

Portuguese ships used often to lie for months at a time off the island of Canton, that is to say off the rocky island of Sanchoan (Sancian, Chang-Tschouen) in order to make a landing there at a favourable opportunity, and carry on smuggling with the Chinese of Canton. The island itself was barren, and during the time of their stay, the Portuguese lived in hastily constructed huts of straw, which they burned on their departure. To this place, therefore, Francis caused himself to be conveyed, in order that he might risk his life for the conversion of China.

Abandoned though he had been hitherto, the Saint was now to be thrown still more on his own resources. From among his companions, he was obliged to send back a Portuguese lay-brother, as unfit for work, and an interpreter whom he had

¹ If he should be obliged to return to India, he wrote on October 22nd, 1552 : " não vou com esperança que em tempo de D. Alvaro de Gama se fará couza n'a China, de que fique memoria." Mon. Xav., I., 791.

² From Singapore on July 21, 1552 : Mon. Xav., I., 767.

secured for Canton soon left him for fear of the punishments of the mandarins. The captain of the ship, who had brought him out of consideration for Alvaro, was not very well-disposed to him. He was, it is true, received into the hut of a Portuguese, who looked after him, but after the departure of this man, he suffered great want, and had to beg for bread. Only a Chinaman of about twenty, who had been brought up in Goa, and had almost forgotten his own language, and a servant, were faithful to him.

In spite of all this, and notwithstanding the warnings he received from the Portuguese, as well as from the Chinese traders, Francis held fast to his resolution. A Chinaman was at last induced, by the promise of a large reward, to undertake to convey him to Canton, and to set him down before daybreak at the gate of the city. He had to trust to this man, in spite of the danger that he might take the reward, and then get rid of the troublesome stranger by throwing him into the sea. Even this danger did not deter him, and when the Portuguese begged him, for fear of his getting them into trouble, to put off his hazardous enterprise until after the departure of their ships, he was obliged to proceed with his great undertaking quite alone, and deprived of all earthly assistance.

His plans, however, were never carried out. On November 22nd, 1552, he was attacked by a violent fever, and on the 27th, at two o'clock in the morning, he was claimed by death. On this barren island, in a wretched hut, he met his end, as his great soul would have desired it, in the full strength of his manhood, in the full fervour of his love for God and man, in the utmost poverty and abandonment, like in his death to Him, in whose footsteps, in life, he had always endeavoured to tread.¹

¹ Concerning Xavier's death and burial we possess the report of an eye-witness, the Chinaman, Anton (in CROS, II., 342-354; cf. VALIGNANI in *Mon. Xav.*, I., 190). That the day of his death was not December 2, but November 27, is shown by CROS (contrary to ASTRAIN in *Razon y Fé*, V., 375-386, Madrid, 1903), *loc. cit.*, 355 *seqq.*, and in the *Études*, XCVII., 680-702, Paris, 1903. Cf. *Analecta Bollandiana*, XXIII., 410, Brussels, 1904.

The only witness of his death, the Chinaman Anton, laid his body, according to the Chinese custom, in a sort of coffin, into which was sprinkled lime, to hasten decomposition and enable the bones to be carried away. When the grave was opened once more,¹ shortly before the departure of the ship, on February 17th, 1553, they found the body perfectly incorrupt. In Malacca it was solemnly received, but was buried without a coffin. On August 15th, they again found no trace of corruption. The Saint's body was brought to the church of St. Paul in Goa, at the beginning of Holy Week, 1554, and was later placed in a tomb in the convent of Bom Jesus, where, to this day, it has never fallen into dust.²

In Francis Xavier were united qualities, which, at first sight, seem to contradict one another. He was, above all, a man of action, who could never rest, and to whom everything he did seemed trifling and of no importance, because his eyes were always fixed on what yet remained to be done. He would have liked to have been everywhere at the same time, in order to spread Christianity in all directions. His activity, therefore, might appear feverish and unbalanced, his hazardous enterprises foolhardy, his constant journeyings as the expression of a mere love of wandering. Alexander Valignani was alone, in the XVIth century, in pointing out, in contradiction to such a view, the successes of the Saint. "He was guided in all he did," Valignani remarks,³ "by a wonderful foresight, for his undertakings succeeded very well, and in all the places

¹ It is marked by an inscription in Portuguese and Chinese. The remains of the chapel erected over the hut in which Xavier died are quite near (see Supplement to the *Allgemeine Zeitung*, 1865, No. 30). A **Relatio sepulturae S. Francisci erectae in Sanciano insula anno 1700*, with a plan of the island and the chapel of the Jesuit missionary, Caspar Castner, in Cod. 150 of the Library in Lyons. Cf. SOMMERVOGEL, II., 853; *Civiltà Catt.* (1894), IV., 757 *seqq.*

² ADOLF MÜLLER, A pilgrimage to Goa to the grave of St. Francis Xavier, in the *Katholischen Missionen* (1891), 69 *seqq.* 100 *seqq.*; *Civil. Catt.* (1891), 371 *seqq.*

³ VALIGNANI in *Mon. Xav.*, I., 192.

where he came, he left a seed of God's Word, which blossomed later on and brought forth good fruit." In order to estimate properly the activity of Francis Xavier, we must bear in mind that he did not look upon himself as a single independent missionary, but as the superior of a band of such, whom he had to distribute over the half of a continent. In order to be able to assign to each the sphere of activity to which he was best suited, he had to know the countries and peoples from his own observation. He often used to say, when he sent missionaries to a certain district: "How could I send these messengers with a clear conscience, if I did not know the conditions there from my own observation and experience?"¹ It appeared to him to be his mission to prepare the way everywhere, to take the task of the pioneer on his own shoulders, so that his fellow-workers and those under him should be able to reap the fruits of his labours. "I beg God, our Lord," he writes in the year of his death, "to grant me the grace to open the way for others even if I attain nothing myself."² It is hardly possible to overestimate the importance of the fact that, thanks to his travels and hardships, the countries of Asia in which the labours of the missionaries were most likely to be successful were clearly indicated, namely, not the effeminate and dreamy Hindoos and Malays, but rather the Chinese and Japanese.

To this restless activity, Xavier joined the intuition and fervour of the mystic. Already in the early days of his priesthood, the signs of mysticism were to be seen in him.³ He devoted to prayer many hours of the night, and as much time as his labours left him free, and he found such interior delight in it that all his troubles seemed to him "a sweet cross."⁴ The determination with which he clung to his resolutions, he obtained by laying his plans before God. He was undecided for a long time, he wrote, as to whether he should proceed to

¹ *Ibid.* 65.

² Mon. Xav., I., 701. He often expresses the wish to be able to prepare the way for others, e.g. *ibid.* I., 695, 729.

³ CROS., I., 145.

⁴ A. DE QUADROS (1555) in the Sel. Ind. Epist., 185. Letter of Xavier of November 5, 1549: Mon. Xav., I., 576.

Japan or not, but when God gave him to understand, in the depths of his soul, that such was His Will, then he could not fail in answering the call without being worse than the heathens of Japan.¹

In spite of the great sacrifices which Xavier demanded from himself, he was by no means strict or severe towards others, but was of a captivating mildness and humility, and displayed a loveable friendliness in his dealings with his neighbours. He understood how to suit himself to everybody and to win their regard ; princes and great dignitaries in Portugal, as well as soldiers and sailors, or the half-civilised barbarians in India. In Malacca, he went to the place where the soldiers were playing, and when they wished to stop out of respect for him, he encouraged them to continue, remarking jokingly that soldiers are not monks, and that he wished to enjoy himself with them.² He sent a sharp reprimand to a member of his order in Malacca, who had a severe and abrupt manner.³ He was full of joy and merriment everywhere, and one of his companions, the Japanese, Bernard, who came later to Europe and died at Coimbra, relates of him,⁴ that in their most difficult journeys in Japan, he would often skip for joy, throw an apple into the air and catch it again, while tears of joy would stream from his eyes when he praised God aloud, who had chosen him to publish the joyful tidings in those far lands.

He showed the greatest respect for ecclesiastical dignitaries, and the members of other religious orders, and required those under him to do likewise. Only once did he appeal to his powers as Papal nuncio, and that was when, in Malacca, Alvaro wished to prevent his journey to China. He thought everything could be attained by humility, and that it was better to do a little good without causing irritation, than much good with bad feeling.⁵

* ¹ Letter of June 22, 1549 : Mon. Xav., I., 539.

² VALIGNANI, 68.

³ Letter April 14, 1552 : Mon. Xav., I., 745 *seqq.*

⁴ F. FOURNIER in the *Études*, CIX., 666 (1906).

⁵ Mon. Xav., I., 746.

“The Apostle of the Indies,” so wrote three generations ago the Protestant diplomat, John Crawford, “deserves to be counted among the greatest men who ever came to Eastern Asia. No one can read his life, so full of virtues and merits, without being carried away by admiration for the unselfishness of this great man.”

The latest researches have fully confirmed this opinion. A Protestant missionary in Japan gives us the results of his investigations concerning Francis Xavier in the following terms: “Whoever contemplates his indefatigable activity in an unprejudiced manner, cannot fail to recognize that he bears the title of apostle with perfect justice. Xavier was not only a disciple of Ignatius, whom he venerated to an almost religious degree, nor only a devoted member of the Society of Jesus . . . he was also a follower of Jesus Himself, on whose model he had formed himself, learning from Him, in a degree to which few attain, the lessons of humility, modesty, mortification, joyful resignation and loving condescension to the most lowly. In heartfelt intimacy with his Divine Model, this holy man had penetrated into the secrets of God’s kingdom. His whole life showed that he felt himself called, not by men, and not through men, but by Jesus Christ and God. . . This gave him the intrepid, undaunted courage of a hero, who, fearing God and nothing else in the world, shrank from no danger, and willingly encountered the greatest; this spurred him on to that burning zeal, in which he never tired of working as long as it was day for him; this filled him with the confidence of victory which is the pledge of success.”

“For such a vocation to the apostolate, Xavier was endowed by nature with qualities which must have proved of the greatest service. He was gifted with a clear understanding and great intellectual activity, he was magnanimous and full of enthusiasm, and with all his mildness and gentleness was full of fire and energy, while through all his humility there shone a perfect confidence in himself; a moral equipment from which God could well expect great things, when, after he had given up his life, his worldly pleasures and earthly ambitions, he fixed his hopes on Him alone and on eternal life.

At the same time, Xavier was not only a servant of God and a true disciple of Jesus, he was also a son and servant of His church, and a true member of the Society to which he had dedicated himself. His understanding of the doctrine of Christ was that of the Catholic Church, his piety was that of his Order. This ought not, however, to make his Protestant judges blind to the fact that he was a man of God . . . who with heart and soul clung to his holy and sublime vocation.”¹

In the Catholic world the veneration of Francis Xavier which was inaugurated by his canonization by Gregory XV. in 1622, is still living and fruitful. Old Goa is a dead town at the present day, and only awakes to life when the earthly remains of Francis Xavier are exposed to the veneration of thousands of the faithful.² Rome, since 1616, possesses, in the right hand of the Saint, with which he baptized countless thousands, a precious relic. The magnificent altar which contains it stands opposite the shrine of the founder of his Order. No greater honour could fall to the lot of the disciple of Ignatius, but he deserves it in the fullest degree, for his heroic labours introduced a new epoch for the christianizing of the whole civilized world of the East.

¹ HAAS, 232-233.

² Concerning the veneration of St. Francis Xavier, *cf.* DAURIGNAC, *Gesch. des hl. Franz Xaver*, German by Clarus, Frankfort, 1865, 396 *seqq.*, 408 *seqq.*, 418 *seqq.*, 429 *seqq.*; CROS, II., 478 *seqq.*; A. BROU, *Saint François Xavier*, II., 370 *seqq.*, Paris, 1912; SOMMERVOGEL, *Bibl.*, X., 1657 *seqq.* Concerning the last great pilgrimages to Old Goa, see *Kölnische Volkszeitung*, 1911, No. 87.

CHAPTER XIII.

JULIUS III. IN RELATION TO LETTERS AND ART. MICHAEL ANGELO AND THE REBUILDING OF SAINT PETER'S. THE VILLA GIULIA.

JULIUS III., who had received a classical training from the humanist, Raphael Brandolini Lippo, lived at a time when the Renaissance had reached its zenith. He had always displayed a lively interest in science and art, and it was, therefore, **natural** that great things should have been expected from him after his elevation to the Papacy. The humanists at once began to hail his election,¹ and openly declared their hopes of the beginning of a Golden Age.² It seemed certain that the unusual and well known generosity of the Pope would be favourable to their hopes, but it soon became clear that the means for a true return to the age of Mæcenas were not available. The financial distress, which made itself felt only too soon, and which was increased to an almost unbearable degree by the war with Parma, had a paralysing and restraining effect in all other fields of activity. It is significant of the unfavourable circumstances which prevailed, that the wish of the Pope to have the works of his master, Brandolini, published, in token of his gratitude, should not have been fulfilled.³

Julius III., however, showed no lack of desire to be a patron

¹ A. F. RAINERIUS, *Thybris s. de creatione Iulii III. P.M.*, Ronæ 1550.

² Cf. the Poem *Divo Julio III. Pontif. Max., in the Cod. Ottob., 1351, p. 3b, Vatican Library. See also the panegyric of Julius III. by Muzio, in which he says: "Nuovo Papa, nuovo anno et anno santo Risplende al mondo." Rime, 656, Venice, 1551.

³ Cf. BROM in the *Römischen Quartelschrift*, II., 177-8, 180 *seqq.*

of learning as his great predecessor had been, and humanists such as Galeazzo Florimonte, Romolo Amaseo and Paolo Sadoletto readily found appointments at his chancery.¹ The Pope also passed over the fact that, now and again, pagan expressions found their way into the documents compiled by these men, even when they dealt with matters of purely ecclesiastical importance, a thing which would justly have been blamed in later times, when stricter views prevailed.² The traditional and much too great freedom of speech which prevailed in Rome at that time, was by no means lessened under Julius III., and Pasquino could again jeer and mock as he had done before in the classical days of the Renaissance.³

It was far more to the credit of Julius III., who also collected a library of his own,⁴ that he appointed the learned Cardinal Marcello Cervini to be librarian for life of the Vatican Library, as early as February 24th, 1550, and invested him with full powers.⁵ It was in accordance with the wishes of Cervini that, three years later, the Pope sent an envoy to the Greek Basilian monasteries, in order to borrow the sacred and profane manuscripts preserved there, for the purpose of having them copied.⁶

In the first year of his pontificate, Julius III. interested himself in the reform of the Roman University. On November 5th, 1550, he entrusted Cardinals Cervini, Morone, Crescenzi and Pole with this task.⁷ This commission, to which were

¹ Cf. *supra* p. 74.

² See PALLAVICINI, 13, 17, 2.

³ Cf. GNOLI, Storia di Pasquino ; Nuova Antologia, XXV., 74 (1890).

⁴ Cf. the inscription in CIACONIUS, III., 758. In this library, the Apronian Virgil was to be found, which came into the hands of Card. I. del Monte after the death of Julius III., and later went to Florence : see TIRABOSCHI, III., 29-30 (Neapolitan Edition).

⁵ See the *brief in Appendix No. 5 (Secret Archives of the Vatican).

⁶ See the *brief of February 24, 1553, for Hannib. Spatafore archimand. Messan. O. S. Bas. in the Appendix Nos. 17-18. (Secret Archives of the Vatican). ⁷ See MASSARELLI, 198, 199.

afterwards added Cardinals Guido Ascanio Sforza and Maffei, inaugurated several salutary reforms in 1552. Besides this the efficiency of this institution was doubled by an increase in its revenues.¹ German universities, such as Heidelberg, Ingolstadt and Würzburg, were also favoured by Julius III., and the college in Dillingen was raised by him to the status of a university.²

The evidences of favour for the humanists and literati were, on account of the pecuniary difficulties, not very numerous, but whenever one of these received any promotion, he expressed his thanks in extravagant but unmeaning verses, as was the case with Girolamo Fracastoro,³ Fausto Sabeo⁴ and Francesco Modesto.⁵

Among the teachers whom Julius III. provided for the young Roberto de' Nobili were Giulio Poggiano and the Servite, Ottavio Pantagato, the former celebrated as an elegant stylist, and the latter as an eminent humanist. The noble poetess, Ersilia Cortese,⁶ wife of Giovan Battista del Monte, and the learned poet, Onorato Fascitelli,⁷ also enjoyed the Pope's favour. Julius III. appointed the eminent Ludovico Beccadelli as nuncio in Venice, and later on his vicar-general in Rome; when Morone went to Germany, Beccadelli accompanied him, and it was reported that he would be created a cardinal on his return.⁸ The learned Guglielmo Sirleto was

¹ See MARINI, Lettera, 121, 127; RENAZZI, II., 132-3, 252 *seqq.*

² See HAUZ, Heidelberg, I., 229, 449, 452, 460, 464; PRANTL, Ingolstadt-München, I., 185; *cf.* RAYNALDUS, 1551, n. 76; WEGELE, Würzburg II. 26., *seqq.* Concerning Dillingen *cf. supra* p. 227.

³ *Ad Iulium III. P.M.*, most excellently rendered by SCHLÜTER, M.A. Flaminus und seine Freunde, 145 *seqq.*, Mayence, 1847.

⁴ See CICONIUS, III., 757. Achille Bocchi also belongs to the humanists promoted by Julius III., see MAZZUCHELLI, II., 3, 1389.

⁵ *Cf.* ALBINI, Il Modesto, Imola, 1886, and Atti per le prov. d. Romagna, Ser. 3, XV., 376 (1897).

⁶ See TIRABOSCHI, VII., 1, 22 and 3, 47 (Neapolitan Edition).

⁷ *Cf.* MINIERI RICCIO, Mem. d. scritt. di Napoli, 73 *seqq.*

⁸ See BECCADELLI, Monum., I., 35-6, 40, 65.

promoted, and his commentary on the New Testament, which was directed against Valla and Erasmus, was approved.¹

Unfortunately, Julius III. also had relations with literati of quite a different stamp. The Pope had hardly been elected when Paolo Giovio addressed a letter of congratulation to him, which is very characteristic. In this Giovio expresses the hope that he will be able to come to Rome as soon as he has recovered from the gout, and the weather has improved; he takes the liberty of remarking, however, how greatly he was disappointed when the apartments he was to have occupied in the Vatican had been otherwise disposed of; he was quite determined that the Pope should compensate him with a pension. Cardinal Medici was commissioned by the Pope to assure Giovio that a dwelling in the Vatican would be provided for him.² Although the said Cardinal informed him once more in June, 1550, that the Pope was well disposed to him,³ the calculating humanist thought it wise to ingratiate himself still further by the dedication of a work to His Holiness. In the dignified brief of August 15th, 1551, in which Julius III. thanked Giovio for the dedication of his "Eulogium of Celebrated Men," a book of international interest, he promised him an honourable reception⁴ on his proposed journey to Rome, and a few months later sent him a reward. Giovio thereupon promised to extol his benefactor with a "golden pen."⁵ His death, however, on December 11th, 1552, put an end to his plan.

Pietro Aretino had at once opened relations with Julius III., and sent him a sonnet on his election. The Pope was weak enough to feel flattered by this, and Aretino was immediately rewarded.⁶ On October 31st, 1550, the officious poet sent the

¹ Cf. MERCATI, in the Theol. Revue (1909), 61.

² See Periodico de Como, XVI. (1904), 17-18.

³ *Ibid.* 18, n. 1.

⁴ See the *brief of August 15, 1551, in Appendix No. 14 (Secret Archives of the Vatican).

⁵ See letter of December 6, 1551, in ATANAGI, Lett. facete, I., 84-5, Venice 1582.

⁶ "A Pietro Aretino ha fatto S.S.^{tà} gratia d'un cavalierato di S. Pietro, che suol vendersi 300 scudi o più et questo per conto d'un

Pope some more verses.¹ How well Aretino perceived the changed tendency of the times is shown by the religious writings which he composed, and a new edition of which he dedicated to the Pope.² Aretino came, full of hope, to Rome in 1553, where Julius received him very kindly, so that the vain poet at once dreamed of attaining to the dignity of Cardinal ; as this, of course, was not bestowed on him, he left the Eternal City a disappointed man.³

Although not much was to be hoped for from Julius III. by the humanists, they still continued to extol him in poems.⁴ The extravagance and pomposity of this sort of literature, in which all the gods of the ancients play their part, was in singular contrast to the services which the Pope really rendered to the advancement of literature. A still unpublished panegyric in verse by Antonius Franciscus Rainerius, about the pontificate of Julius III., is very characteristic of such men.⁵ In this the generous disposition of the Pope is extolled, as are his care in supplying Rome with provisions, the summoning

sonetto ch'egli fece sopra la creatione di S.S.^{ta}." Buonanni April 30, 1550 (State Archives Florence).

¹ Ternali in gloria di Giulio III., etc., Lyons, 1551 ; *cf.* MAZUCHELLI, I., 2, 1018.

² See Al beat. Giulio III., etc., Il genesi, l'umanità di Christo e i salmi. Opere di P. Ar., Vinegia, 1551 ; *cf.* BRUNET, I., 401 ; MAZUCHELLI, I., 2, 1016 ; also LUZIO in the Giorn. stor. di lett. Ital., XXIX., 236-7.

³ *Cf.* Lett. al Aretino, II., 345, 391-2, 498, Paris, 1609 ; MAZUCHELLI, I., 2, 1013. Atti Mod., III., 88 ; BONGI, Annali Giolitini, II., 10 ; LUZIO, Pronostico, xxii., xxxv.n.

⁴ Besides the poems in CIACONIUS, III, 357, *cf.* the poems mentioned *supra* p. 326, n. 2, and those referred to in the following note. See also the *poem in the Addit. MS. 17514, of the British Museum, and Vol. VI. of this work p. 457 note. Gian Vitale sang the praises of the Pope and all the members of the Sacred College (*cf.* MONGITORE, Bibl. Sic., I., 305) in his Sac. Rom. Ecclesiae Elogia, Roma, 1553.

⁵ *Antonii Francisci Rainerii, Mediol. de vita sanctiss. ac beatiss. Iulii III. Pont. Max. ab initio pontific. (Cod. Ottob., 865, p. 4 *seqq.* Vatican Library).

of the Council, and even the war with Parma, which he had waged for the defence of religion ! The death of his nephew, Giovan Battista del Monte, is deplored, and Fabiano del Monte is extolled as the comfort of his old age. There is added a well-merited verse of praise for the Pope's efforts to secure peace, and, finally, the artistic enterprises of Julius are lauded in an altogether extravagant manner ; the poet, it may be added, has nothing to say about the advancement of letters.¹

There is no lack of writings, both printed and in manuscript, dedicated to Julius III.² Among those which are printed, the "Anatomy of Vice" is noteworthy ; this is by Lorenzo Davidico, who, in view of the depravity of the clergy of the cinquecento, which he depicts unsparingly, had fixed his hopes on the new Orders : the Jesuits, the Barnabites and the Theatines.³

¹ REUMONT'S statement (III., 2,705) concerning an academy in the villa of Julius III., originated in an old erroneous interpretation of the inscription there, which has already been corrected by TIRABOSCHI (VII., I, 119).

² In the Vatican Library I noted *Cod. Vat. 5831 : Io. Petri Ferretti de exarchatu Raven. libri 7, 5832 : I.P. Ferretti ecclesiasticarum disciplinarum divinarumque constit. commentaria sive de institutis et moribus eccles. libri 8. (See also in the Secret Archives of the Vatican, XI., 45, p. 324 *seqq.* *Tractus de re frumentaria [1551] ; 561 *seqq.* *Ptolomaeus Blaesius Nicanus, De morte Io. Bapt. de Monte in bello Mirandol. [1551] ; 571 *seqq.* : *Tractatus de transitu exercitus petendo ac concedendo vel denegando [1555]. Cod. Vat., 3561 : *Andreas de Monte, super insig. montium (Latin and Hebrew) : *Triumphus Montium editus a fratre Mariano Cavense eremita [ord. S. Aug. ; cf. OSSINGER, Bibl. August.] s. theolog. colture ad divum Iulium III. P.M. et O. (dedication dated, Cavis, Kal. Maii 1551) in the Cod. R. 4, 18 of the Angelica Library in Rome. Theological works dedicated to Julius III. in LAUCHERT, 31, 124-5, 432, 465, 602, 654. Concerning a work dedicated to the Pope by G. G. Albani : De immunit eccl. see MAZZUCHELLI, I., I, 274. The curious work by G. B. Modio : Il convito o vero del peso della moglie, Rome, 1554, is dedicated to Cardinal I. del Monte.

³ L. DAVIDICO, Anatomia delli vitii, Florence, 1550, preface.

The most important work dedicated to Julius III. was a volume of masses for four voices,¹ by Giovanni Pierluigi da Palestrina². The composer, afterwards of world-wide celebrity, thus expressed his thanks for the position of director of the choir of St. Peter's, which had been bestowed on him by the Pope in September, 1551. In January, 1555, Julius III. summoned his protégé to become a member of the choir of singers of the papal chapel, omitting in his case the searching examination which had been prescribed for all candidates on August 5th, 1554. As it was a case of a composer of such promise, Julius also overlooked the fact that Palestrina was married, although the charter for the members of the choir of the Papal chapel prescribed celibacy.³

Finally, it is also worthy of note that the life of Michael Angelo by Ascanio Condivi, and published in Rome, in July, 1553, by Antonio Blado, was dedicated to Julius III. It is suggested by the author that the dedication will certainly be agreeable to His Holiness, as he so much prized the virtue and genius of the master.

Nothing shows more clearly the contradictory qualities which were combined in the character of Julius III., than the fact

Cf. concerning this work, TACCHI VENTURI, I., 34 *seqq.* Concerning I. Nachianti's *Enarrationes* in epist. Pauli ad Ephesios, which was dedicated to Julius III., see LAUCHERT, 588-9. ZIMMERMANN mentions the J. Strada appointed by Julius III. in the *Mitteil. des Oestr. Inst., Erg-Bd., VI., 836*. Among the privileges to printers that of March 24, 1553, is of interest: **De non imprimendo ad 10 annos historiam regum Gothorum* [appeared in 1554; see BERTOLOTTI, in the *Arch. stor. Ital., VII. (1891), 117-128*] a fratre archiepiscopi Upsalensis, quam archiepiccopus intendit imprimi facere.

¹ Rome, 1554. Copy in the Academia di S. Cecilia, Rome.

² Born 1526, not 1524, as BAINI thinks, nor 1514, as AMBROS (IV., 3) gives it. See HABERL in the *Kirchenmusikalischen Jahrbuch*, 1886, 42.

³ Palestrina took up his new post on January, 13, 1555; see *Diarium* in AMBROS, IV., 6; *cf.* CELANI in the *Riv. music. Ital., XIV. (1907), 103*.

that the man who honoured an Aretino should have given expression to the beautiful idea that he would willingly give up the remainder of the years allotted to him to lengthen those of Michael Angelo.¹

These words were followed up by actions which corresponded with them. Whenever he had an opportunity, the Pope showed his respect for and confidence in the great master, to an even greater extent than had been the case with Paul III. He gave open expression to this by making Michael Angelo sit beside him² in the presence of several Cardinals and other great dignitaries, and by giving him the large salary of fifty scudi a month.³ These tokens of favour were all the more significant, as the disparagers and detractors of Michael Angelo never tired, now as of old, of stirring up intrigues against him. The master, who was already suffering greatly under the weight of years, also had to endure great anguish of mind. Hatred and envy were the outcome of the exceptional position to which he had been called by Paul III., for the rebuilding of St. Peter's, a matter in which Julius III. also showed the greatest interest, and which he zealously promoted.⁴ The stern rectitude with which Michael Angelo provided that "promises, emoluments and presents" should play no part in this vast work, added to the number of his enemies from day to day. Untroubled, however, by all this hostility, Michael Angelo remained true to his principle, never to accept any material for the building which was not trustworthy and serviceable, even if it fell from heaven.⁵

¹ CONDIVI, lviii.

² See Ticciati's supplement to Condivi; *Quellenschriften zur Kunstgesch.*, VI., 97.

³ This "solita provisione" was paid punctually up to the death of Julius III.; see *Intr. et Exit., 1554-1555 in the Cod. Vat. 10605, where it is regularly booked from March, 1554, till March, 1555: "A m. Michelangelo Buonarotti scudi venticinque d'oro et venticinque di moneta per el mese passato." (VaticanLib.).

⁴ See the *Bulls in Appendix No. 27.

⁵ See *Lettere di M.*, ed. Milanese, 555. Cf. CONDIVI, lix.; see also THODE, I., 220.

As had been the case in the time of Paul III., so now again it was the followers of Sangallo who raised a storm against the director of the rebuilding of St. Peter's. Although he had been invested with the most unlimited authority, they hoped, in view of the complaisance and irresolution of Julius III., that this time they would attain their end. The anxious fear with which Michael Angelo guarded the secrets of his studio was used to prejudice the members of the Fabbrica di S. Pietro against him. At the end of the year 1550, these latter set themselves to address a letter to the Pope, which was intended to destroy the confidence which Julius III. had in the master. The principal accusation, besides that of extravagance, concerned the secrecy with which the plans were kept. "As to the building, and how it will turn out," says the letter, "the deputies can make no report, as everything is kept secret from them, as if they had nothing to do with it. They have several times protested, and are now protesting again to ease their consciences, that they do not approve of the manner in which Michael Angelo is proceeding, especially as regards the demolition. The destruction has been, and is still to-day, so great, that all who have witnessed it have been deeply moved. Nevertheless, if Your Holiness approves of it, we, the deputies, shall have no further complaint to make."

The result of these accusations was the celebrated meeting of the members of the Fabbrica and others engaged on the rebuilding, summoned by Julius III., before whom Michael Angelo was to justify himself. According to the account of Vasari,¹ the Pope himself communicated to the master the most important, and the only detailed accusation, which the building commission, and especially Cardinals Salviati and Cervini had made against him. This concerned the bad lighting of the apse of the new St. Peter's. Michael Angelo asked permission to be allowed to answer the deputies of the Fabbrica in person. Then followed a dramatic discussion with Cardinal Cervini, who avowed himself to be the originator of the accusation. "Monsignore," replied Michael Angelo, "three other windows

¹ VASARI VII. 232-3 ; Cf. THODE I, 222-3.

are to be placed above those already provided." "You have never let a word as to this be heard," answered the Cardinal. Michael Angelo replied, "I am not obliged, and have never intended to be obliged to give information concerning my plans to your Eminence, or to anyone else. It is your duty to provide the money and to see that nothing is stolen. It is my business alone to look after the plans of the building." Then, turning to the Pope, he continued: "Holy Father, see what reward I get; if the afflictions I experience do not prove of advantage for my soul, then indeed do I lose my time and trouble." Graciously laying his hand on his shoulder, Julius answered him, saying: "You are gaining merit for both body and soul, have no fear."

The attempt, therefore, to overthrow the master had, on the contrary, the effect of strengthening his position more than ever. In order to put a stop to further troubles, Julius III., on January 23rd, 1552, ratified the *motu proprio* of Paul III., of October, 1549, sanctioned everything hitherto carried out by Michael Angelo for the building of St. Peter's, ordered that his models should be carefully preserved, and only altered by himself, and confirmed the extensive powers already bestowed on him as chief architect of St. Peter's.¹

This was not, however, the end of Michael Angelo's difficulties. More painful than the hostility, which did not meanwhile cease,² but which, thanks to the favour of the Pope,

¹ The document, erroneously given by BUONANNI (80 *seq.*), was first published correctly by POGATSCHER in the *Repert. für Kunstwiss.*, XVIII., 403-4. GIORDANI (p. 49) writes: "Già fin dall' 1552 era entrato il Vignola a servizio della chiesa e in quell' anno gli si attribuiva il pomposo titolo di architetto della basilica di S. Pietro, in aiuto a Michelangelo," and likewise cites *R. Tesor. seg. 1552, f. 10. When one opens this volume in the State Archives Rome, however, one finds at the place quoted, for January, 1552, only the entry: "Al Vignola architetto di N.S.sc. 25 d'oro." This corresponds as little with the contents given by Giordani, as the other passages of this volume (f. 8 and 27 where "per la cura de architetto 13 scudi d'oro" is entered.

² This is evident from the letters, VASARI, VIII., 319.

he had no longer cause to fear, was another disastrous circumstance which now overtook him. The exhaustion of the Papal finances had, by May, 1551, the effect of causing the money necessary for the continuation of the rebuilding of St. Peter's to come in ever decreasing amounts ; how much this was the case is shown from the fact that from January 1st to May, 1551, 121,554 ducats were provided for the building, while only half this sum was to hand during the next four years.¹ In consequence of this critical situation, and the renewed difficulties of the master, Duke Cosimo I. thought that he would at last succeed in getting Michael Angelo to return to Florence.² The latter was, however, determined to remain at his post in the Eternal City. In a letter of August 20th, 1554, Vasari employed all his eloquence to induce him to return to Florence, urging the afflictions which beset him in Rome, and the want of appreciation shown for him there.³ Michael Angelo, whose hand had already begun to tremble greatly, thanked him in a few words. "From your letter," he wrote, "I recognise the love you bear me, and you may well believe that I would gladly lay my bones to rest beside those of my father, as you beg me to do ; should I, however, go away from here, then great disadvantages would ensue for the building of St. Peter's, and I should be the cause of great scandal and misfortune. When everything is so far forward that nothing more can be changed, then I hope to do what you write, should it not be sinful to cause discomfort to several rascals, who expect me to go away from here at once."⁴

It was, above all, religious motives which caused Michael

¹ FEA, *Notizie intorno a Raffaele*, Rome, 1822, 35. It was most significant that the Fabbrica of St. Peter's in 1554 did not receive less than 50,000 scudi from the inheritance of Sigismondo de' Conti ; see the introduction to his *Storie*, I., xxxiii., Rome, 1883.

² Endeavours had already been made in this direction as early as June, 1550 ; see the *letters of Buonanni, dat. Rome, June 8, 1550, in the State Archives, Florence. Cf. VASARI, VII., 235-6, and THODE, I., 454 concerning the attempts in 1552.

³ VASARI, VIII., 318-9. THODE, I., 455.

⁴ *Lettere*, ed. Milanese, 534. GUHL, I., 159.

Angelo to devote his last powers to the great work for which he had refused any earthly payment, as he wished only to work for the love of God, out of veneration for the Prince of the Apostles, and for the salvation of his soul. The thoughts which filled his mind at that time are shown by the touching sonnet which he enclosed in his letter to Vasari:—

Giunto è già 'l corso della vita mia,
 Con tempestoso mar per fragil barca,
 Al comun porto, ov'a render si varca
 Conto e ragion d'ogn 'opra trista e pia.
 Onde l'affettuosa fantasia,
 Che l'arte mi fece idol 'e monarca,
 Conosco or ben quant'era d'error carca,
 E quel ch'a mal suo grado ogn 'uom desia.
 Gli amorosi pensier, gia vani e lieti,
 Che fieno or, s' a duo morte m'avvicino ?
 D'una so'l certo, e l'altra mi minaccia.
 Nè pinger nè scolpir fia piu che quieti
 L'anima volta a quell' Amor divino
 Ch'aperse, a prender noi, in croce le braccia.¹

Condivi, in his life of Michael Angelo, tells us how Julius III., in his admiration for the aged master, showed the tenderest consideration for his failing strength, and carefully avoided taxing it, though always seeking his opinion and advice in his artistic undertakings.² Several special duties also fell to the lot of Michael Angelo. He designed,³ for example, the plans for the rebuilding of Bramante's staircase in the Belvedere,

¹ GUASTI, Rime, 230.

² CONDIVI, lviii.

³ VASARI VII., 228 *seqq.*, 233. GEYMÜLLER, Michelangelo als Architekt, 38, 40, 46, KALLAB, 89. THODE, I., 452-3. In the account books of Julius III. (Tesor. seg. 1555, p. 53b) we find the *payment of 10 scudi for Bastiano (Malenotti) soprastante della fabbrica di S. Pietro a buon conto del modello che m. Michelangelo pittore ha cominciata per far una facciata di un palazzo di ordine di N.S. (State Archives, Rome). It is evident from this that the similar note in LANCIANI, III., 39, n. 1, does not refer to the Vatican, as he thinks, but to the palace beside S. Rocco.

and for a fountain which was to be erected there ; he also made the designs for the palace of the Rota, which was to be built alongside S. Rocco. Fabrizio Boschi, in the Casa Buonarrotti in Florence, has represented Michael Angelo seated beside the Pope, who is surrounded by his court, and explaining to him the plans for the palace of the Rota.¹

Michael Angelo's advice was also sought with regard to an undertaking which still keeps the name of Julius III. alive in Rome, the celebrated Villa or " Vigna di Papa Giulio." ² The Pope proved, in the laying out of this villa, how thoroughly he was animated by the joyous, beauty-loving spirit of the Renaissance. The preference shown, at this period, for artistic elaboration in the designing of country seats, and for the gay enjoyment of life, is evidenced here in all its splendour.

Even as a Cardinal, Julius III. possessed, together with his brother Baldovino, a small villa, with a vigna, about a quarter of an hour outside the Porta del Popolo, on the Flaminian Way, which he had inherited from his uncle, Cardinal Antonio Ciochi. The Campagna, which at that time extended to the gates of Rome, bears a much more kindly appearance on the north than on the south of the city, where the contrasts are greater and the countless relics of antiquity give a very melancholy character to the whole landscape. The charm of rustic solitude which the district outside the Porta del Popolo once possessed has more and more disappeared owing to the encroachments of the modern city, and has been altogether destroyed by the recent drastic changes, the exquisite view on Monte Mario alone remaining. In order fully to appreciate this creation of Julius III. one must bring the former conditions before one's mind. With its gently rising hills, broken by

¹ E. Steinmann intends to publish this picture in his work (shortly to appear) about the portrait of Michael Angelo.

² *Vigna*, not *Villa*. The whole estate is mostly so named by contemporaries. It is also so designated in the *report of Navagero of September 5th, 1556 (in the St. Mark's Library, Venice) concerning the confiscation of the estates of Fabiano del Monte by Paul IV. Lasso also (DRUFFEL, II., 824) speaks only of a " viniera " Massarelli (*cf. infra* p. 345, n. 3) always says " vinea."

steep limestone rocks crowned with evergreen oaks, with the dips in the valley and the then free open vistas over the blue mountain ranges which encircle Rome on the north, this spot was admirably suited for a villa situated in the immediate neighbourhood of the city, a "villa suburbana" such as the great nobles of the Renaissance loved.¹ Julius III. gave evidence of a cultured taste when he resolved to create, by the extension of the already existing grounds, a place of rest and recreation in such lovely surroundings, a place where, freed from the constraints of state, he might enjoy life in his gay manner, give banquets and spend his time in untrammelled conversation with his friends, as well as with poets and artists. The place had also the advantage that the Pope could easily reach it without entering the busy city, by passing through the covered passage from the Vatican to the Castle of St. Angelo, whence a barge could convey him up the Tiber.

It was soon evident that Julius III. intended to carry out his plan with true Roman magnificence. By the purchase of numerous vineyards, and plots of ground,² a very extensive space was procured, in the centre of which the new villa was to arise. The Pope's interest was gradually concentrated on this estate to such an extent that his work in the Vatican

¹ RIEGL (Barockkunst, 104) who carefully interprets the intentions of Julius III., falsely denies to it the character of a "villa suburbana" in which the rural element, that is the garden, is of essential importance, because he knows nothing of these surroundings, which have now entirely disappeared. BURCKHARDT's opinion (Gesch. der Renaissance, 3rd ed., 249) holds good, namely that the Villa of Julius III. is the most important "villa suburbana" we have preserved to-day. "Praedium suburbanum" is the designation clearly bestowed on the whole estate in the inscription mentioned *infra* p. 348, in the second court. On Bufalini's plan (L) which gives the state of the neighbourhood at the beginning of the Pope's reign, the villa is called "vinea S.D.N.P. Iulii III.,"; the Villa itself was not then built.

² Cf. the extracts from the *documents of the State Archives, Rome, in TESORINI, 86-7; LANCIANI, III., 15-16, and BALESTRA in his monograph (p. 9 *seqq.*) quoted *infra* p. 344, n. 1.

began to come to a standstill.¹ His Holiness now began to seek for a model for his new country house from among existing residences. The thought of the celebrated Palazzo del Te, belonging to the Gonzaga family in Mantua, and of the Villa Madama erected by Cardinal Giulio de' Medici, smiling across from the cypress-crowned Monte Mario, filled his imagination.

From the information now at our disposal it is not easy to determine either who designed the plans for the Villa Giulia or who carried them into execution. Vasari claims, in the description in his life, the honour of having drawn up the first plans, even if others carried them out. It was, at all events, he who translated the fantastic ideas of the Pope into sketches, which were then corrected by Michael Angelo. Vignola is supposed to have completed the apartments, halls and decoration of the villa from countless plans of his own, but the deep set nymphæum indisputably owes its origin to Vasari and Ammanati, the latter afterwards executing the loggia over this well-house. Vasari concludes with the significant words: "However, in this work one could display nothing of what one could do, and do nothing in the right way, as, from day to day, the Pope had new ideas, which had to be carried out in accordance with the never-ending instructions

¹ Concerning these undertakings *cf.* of the older writers, CHATTARD, II., xxvi., 14, 49, 193-4, 196, 377, 435-6, 544; III., 106, 110-111, and of the more modern, ANCEL in the *Révue Bénédictine*, XXV., 49-50. See also MAI, *Spicil.*, IX., 376; FORCELLA, VI., 183. Concerning the works in the Belvedere, where the Pope loved to reside at the beginning of his reign (*cf. supra* p. 59), *cf.* also MASSARELLI, 202; LANCIANI, III., 37; KALLAB, 86, 88, 89. One can read the name of Julius III. at the right hand side of the Galleria Lapidaria above a door. The apartments of the maestro di camera, now the residence of the sotto-prefetto of the Vatican palace, were tastefully decorated by Julius III. In two halls, the roof paintings, containing a large coat of arms of Julius III. in the centre, are in a fair state of preservation.

of the maestro di camera, Pier Giovanni Aliotti."¹ In his life of Taddeo Zuccaro, Vasari again refers to his share in the work, emphasizing the fact that he had prepared the drawings for the villa and the nymphæum before any of the others, and that Vignola and Ammanati had merely followed out his designs. The walls, he adds, were executed by Baronino da Casal Monferrato.² Only this last statement is confirmed by the documents concerning the building.³ One seeks in vain among them for the name of Vasari in connection with the sums expended on the villa, while we find on February 1st, 1551, Vignola named as the Pope's architect, with a monthly salary of thirteen gold scudi.⁴ In the life of Girolamo da Carpi, the annoyance of Vasari at the changeable decisions of the Pope, again finds expression, when he mentions that in the evening, His Holiness had rejected what he had sanctioned in the morning.⁵

It is certain that unpleasantness arose between the Pope and Vasari, in consequence of which the latter's work was limited to making the first design.⁶ Vignola, whom Julius III. had known in Bologna, erected the principal part of the villa, and completed his work in the short period between 1551 and 1553, as is proved by the building accounts, while Ammanati executed the nymphæum court.⁷ Nearly all the painters and

¹ VASARI, VII., 694. Aliotti is mockingly referred to by Michael Angelo as "Il Tantecose"; *ibid.* 231.

² *Ibid.* 81-82.

³ See BERTOLOTI, Bartolomeo Baronino da Casalmaggiore, architetto in Roma nel secolo XVI., Casale, 1876, 21.

⁴ KALLAB, Vasari-Studien, 87.

⁵ VASARI, VI., 478.

⁶ See WILlich, 56. Nothing appears to have come of the proposed painting of the loggia of the villa with frescoes in 1553 by Vasari (see KALLAB, 87, 90, 91). At the beginning, Vasari stood high in the favour of Julius III. (see GAYE, Carteggio, II., 377). The contents of the Vasari archives, to be edited by Frey, should throw new light on the relations of Julius III. to Vasari.

⁷ Cf. GURLITT, 41-42; WILlich, 58; THIEME, Künstlerlexicon, I., 414. P. GIORDANI has lately endeavoured in the Mem. e studi

sculptors in the Rome of that day, especially Taddeo Zuccaro and Prospero Fontana, were employed on the decoration of the interior, which was begun in 1552.¹ The Spanish faience, which was procured in 1554 for the flooring, seems to mark the end of the work.²

The laying out of the magnificent gardens and pleasure grounds was carried out with great activity at the same time as the actual building of the villa, as was the purchase of the adjoining land. Besides elms and chestnuts, countless fruit trees were planted, and kitchen gardens and vineyards laid out. Costly shrubs and flowers were procured from Naples, and set in terra cotta vases. The total number of plants and trees purchased amounted to about 36,000, while additional expense was incurred for the erection of aviaries, fish-ponds and various fountains.³

In a sense, the church of S. Andrea, which had been erected by Vignola to the north, on the Flaminian Way, on the spot where Cardinal Bessarion, bearing the relics of the Apostle, had once made a halt, belonged to this magnificent villa, which had gradually absorbed the greater part of the land up to Monte Parioli. An exquisite laurel grove adjoined the church, and this elegant little structure is of special interest on account of the employment, presumably for the first time, of an ellipse cut in half lengthwise, to serve as a means of connecting the two.⁴ An inscription, which may still be read, requests the

intorno a J. Barozzi, 131-2, to fix more clearly the share of Vignola in the villa, but much still remains mere supposition. VENTURI (*loc. cit.*, 355) firmly shares the view of Willich.

¹ See BERTOLOTTI, *loc. cit. supra* 20, and Art. Veneti, 25; P. GIORDANI in L'Arte, X. (1907), 134-5. Concerning a compartment of the arch above the fountain court of the Villa Giulia, see DOLMETSCH, Ornamentenschatz, Stuttgart, 1887, Taf. 57, No. 6.

² See the document from the Secret Archives of the Vatican in App. No. 23.

³ See LANCIANI, III., 16-17.

⁴ Concerning this building, which owed its erection to a vow of Julius III. (*cf. supra* p. 47) *cf.* STERN, Piante e elevatione, profili e spaccati della villa suburbana di Giulio III., Rome, 1784, 107 *seqq.*,

visitors, who have been delighted with the contemplation of the beauties of the villa, to pray in this holy spot for the builder and the owner.

It is very difficult to-day to form any idea of the impression which the Vigna di Papa Giulio then made, for, apart from the demolitions of later times,¹ an essential element is wanting,

LETAROUILLY, I., 199-200; FORCELLA, XII., 211; GURLITT, 51-2, 184, 188; EBE, Spätrenaissance, I., 142-3; WILlich, 64 *seqq.*; LANCIANI, III., 26-27. The church was then called S. Andrea della Vigna, as is to be seen in a *letter of E. Capilupi to Card. Gonzaga of December 20, 1552, in the Gonzaga Archives, Mantua.

¹ The villa estate, which Julius III. willed to his brother Baldovino, had the most varied fortunes. When Baldovino died in August, 1556, Paul IV. confiscated the possessions of Fabiano del Monte in April, 1557, because they had been procured with the money of the Apostolic Camera (TESORONI, 44-5, 99-100). When Pius IV. annulled this sentence, he excepted the Villa Giulia, of which a part was given to the Borromei, and through them came to the Colonna (see BALESTRA in the work cited *infra* p. 344, n. 1, and *ibid.* p. 44 *seq.*). The principal building, already restored in one place under Paul IV. (see Intr. et Exit. 1558, December 8, State Archives, Rome), remained in the possession of the Pope and served for a long time as a lodging for Cardinals, ambassadors and princely personages, who prepared here for their solemn entry into the city (see ERULEI, 23-4). Paul V. restored the nymphæum (see STERN, 76). Clement XIV. and Pius VI. endeavoured to restore the villa, which had suffered greatly from the preceding war troubles, and which fell into complete decay during the French period. Under Leo XII. it served as a veterinary school, and under Gregory XVI. as a hospital, under Pius IX. first as a book dépôt and then as a powder magazine. The Italian government next used the building for military purposes, but, at the instigation of Letarouilly, it was finally made into a museum by royal decree of February 7, 1889, for the remains found outside Rome, and especially for those of Etruscan origin. The present director, Prof. G. Colini, was the first to look after the sadly dilapidated building and the crumbling nymphæum; the last restoration in 1911 is owing to his efforts. Cf. HERMANIN, Kunstchronik, N.F. XXI., 339-340. The performance of comedies in the villa, spoken of here, is not supported by any documentary evidence.

namely the surroundings, which had been laid out with so much artistic taste; the pleasure grounds and the magnificent gardens, in which cypresses, laurels and myrtles exhaled their perfume, pomegranates and other fruit trees blossomed, and fountains threw their sparkling waters into the air, while in all directions, antique marble statues, inscribed tablets, little temples, grottos and summer-houses gleamed among the dark trees.

A little harbour was constructed on the Tiber, where the Pope, arriving from the Vatican in a magnificently equipped barge, landed. From here a shady arbour, 120 paces in length, led to the point where the *Vicolo dell' Arco Oscuro* branches off from the Flaminian Way. Here Julius III. had erected a monumental fountain adorned with Corinthian pilasters and columns. In the two side niches were placed the statues of Fortune and Abundance, and in the centre a large inscription, surmounted by the Papal arms, announced that Julius III. had dedicated this work in the third year of his pontificate, for the benefit of the public. Under the inscription, the water gushed forth from an antique head of Apollo, while the upper corners of the whole structure were adorned with statues of Rome and Minerva, the central pediment with two granite pyramids, and the summit with an antique Neptune.¹

From the street corner, at which the fountain stood, a private road, bordered with fruit trees, led, alongside the *Vicolo dell' Arco Oscuro*, to a circular open space, in which the principal building of the Villa Giulia stood, rising out of a small depres-

¹ EGGER (*Veduten*, I., 1) published a pen and ink drawing from the Vienna library, which is by an anonymous artist of the XVIth century, and which shows the original appearance of the fountain Cf. the monograph of BALESTRA, *La Fontana pubblica di Giulio III. e il palazzo di Pio IV. sulla via Flaminia*, Rome, 1911. Both investigators have overlooked a copper-plate engraving of H. Cock: *Fontis ornatiss. structura a Iulio III. P.M. ad viam Flaminiam facta*, in J. M. Heberle's (Cologne) *Cat.* 103, No. 3003. CLAUSSE, *Les San Gallo*, III., 193-4, Paris, 1902, declares that Francesco da Sangallo was also employed at the construction of this fountain.

sion in the valley ; this is the only part of the villa which is in a good state of preservation to-day.¹ The façade, two storeys in height, with a large rustic porch and pillars supporting a balcony, is severe and simple, for it was considered good taste to conceal the splendour and magnificence of such a building from the outer world. The visitor realizes this when he penetrates into the interior. Through the gateway one enters first the simple atrium, on each side of which there is a large hall. Of the former exceedingly rich decoration of these rooms, there only remain the mythological and allegorical frescoes on the ceiling, the work of Taddeo Zuccaro, and the frieze, richly adorned with stucco and gold.² The halls on the ground floor correspond with two others on the upper storey, while over the atrium there is a central hall, as well as several smaller apartments leading towards the courtyard. These form the only dwelling rooms in the villa ; they were sufficient, as it was not the Pope's intention to create a permanent residence, but only a place of rest and recreation, to which he might retire for a short time, in summer or in winter, generally only for a single day,³ to recruit after the arduous duties of his position. He

¹ The earliest description of the villa is given by B. Ammanati in a letter to M. M. Bonavides of May 2, 1555, first printed in the *Giorn. arcadico*, IV., 387, Rome, 1819, and again in BALESTRA, 65-6. Cf. also STERN, 10-11 ; LETAROUILLY, 421 ; ERULEI, 9 *seqq.* ; WILlich, 61 *seqq.* ; RIEGL, 105-6. LANCIANI (III., 24.) has restored the old designs.

² Cf. LANCIANI, *Dei fratelli Zuccari, pittori*, Jesi, 1892 ; FRIEDLÄNDER, 52.

³ Cf. the exact statements of Massarelli in MERKLE, II., 177, 213, 219, 221, 222, 223. That the Pope frequently went to the villa is also proved from the *report of the Mantuan embassy (Gonzaga Archives, Mantua), but it is an exaggeration, which is connected with the partisanship of the Florentine historian when ADRIANI (VIII., 1) writes : " la maggior parte del tempo dimorava ozioso a un suo giardino, etc." The additional remark : " onde i cortegiani e altri a cui la cosa importava se ne disperavano," shows how such pronouncements originated in personal feelings. The statement that Julius III. laughingly answered an official who addressed to him the customary formula : " Beatissime pater,

wished, however, to be surrounded by beauty on all sides, and therefore had these upper rooms richly decorated with stucco and frescoes. Of special interest are the "vedute," views in perspective with the surrounding landscape, on the frieze, which are still in a good state of preservation, and which represent the appearance of the seven hills in those days, as well as the Villa Giulia itself. This new fashion in pictures, which had already made its appearance in isolated cases, as, for instance, in the Palazzo del Te, was becoming much more common.¹ It inaugurated the period when, in pictorial representations, not the artistic, but the descriptive "motif" takes the first place.

On coming out of the atrium into the first court, one reaches a semi-circular portico, which was richly adorned with stucco and frescoes. The only part which is still comparatively well-preserved, is the decoration of the barrel vaulting, depicting arbours of roses and vines, animated by putti and birds. The statues, of which there were thirty, above the principal cornice and round the walls of the court, have all disappeared.² In the centre there was a large and magnificent antique basin, constructed out of a single piece of porphyry. This gift, by which Ascanio Colonna expressed his thanks for the restoration of his dominions, originally came from the Baths of Titus, and was subsequently taken to the Sala Rotonda of the Pio-

cras erit consistorium" by saying: "Cras erit vinea," is from the same source. On the strength of this anecdote ERULEI says (p. 7: "Per la villa obliò ogni altro negozio religioso e civile!" In 1552 Julius had a great feast at the villa on St. Andrew's Day, to which he invited all the Cardinals; see Lasso's report in DRUFFEL, II., 825, and the *letter of C. Capilupi of November 20, 1552 (Gonzaga Archives, Mantua).

¹ Cf. FRIEDLÄNDER, 86. These views [vedute] are unfortunately not yet published.

² Interesting statements concerning the antiquities of the villa and their subsequent dispersion in LANCIANI, III., 20, *seqq.* 29 *seqq.* Cf. CRACAS, 1888, n. 80; HÜBNER, I., 108-9. Besides the antiques, there were also modern marbles in the vigna, cf. BERTOLOTI, *Artisti Subalp*, 97, Mantua, 1884.

Clementino Museum in the Vatican.¹ The water flowed into the basin, at the sides of which two shells of green veined marble were fixed, from the bill of a swan, held by a Venus.

The sides of this magnificent court were formed by walls two storeys in height, consisting of round arched blind arcades, separated by columns, with Ionic half-columns in front, and crowned by a plain Attic capital. At either end of the two side walls, exits led out respectively to the gardens and the park.

The transverse building which separates this first court from a second one, was built by Ammanati,² as the outline sketches and an inscription on one of the pillars testify. The threefold entrance opens in the centre of the building, and several steps lead to a loggia, the roof of which, once gorgeously decorated with stucco ornamentation and gold, is supported by fourteen Ionic columns of different coloured marbles. To the right and left of this loggia there are rooms, close to which one descends by two external flights of stairs to the sunken fountain-court, with a still lower, and exceedingly graceful grotto, the so-called Fontana Segreta, as it is named in Ammanati's description of May, 1555. The fountain-court itself consists of two storeys, with niches which were adorned with antique busts and statues. Only a few busts are still preserved, but in the lower storey, where there are two grottos resembling loggias, there are still the colossal figures of the Arno and Tiber, crouching over two basins. The semi-circular centre of the court is surrounded by an open-work railing, which was likewise adorned with statues, and which encloses the actual nymphæum, the Fontana Segreta, which lies a storey lower down. The roof of this building is borne up by eight female Hermae, made from a

¹ See VASARI, I., III ; CANCELLIERI, Lettera intorno la maravigliosa tazza di porfido regalata a Giulio III. da A. Colonna, Roma, 1821 ; cf. Arch. d. Soc. Rom., IV., 329-330 ; LANCIANI, II., 190 ; Guida del Museo Vaticano di scoltura, Roma, 1908, 16. The Amazon sarcophagus, now set up in the Cortile del Belvedere also comes from the villa Giulia ; see AMELUNG, Die Skulpturen des Vatikanischen Museums, II., 120 *seqq.*

² See WILlich, 57.

design of Vignola.¹ The pavement is composed of costly marbles of different colours, while from the well the waters of the Aqua Virgo gush forth in a glittering stream. Two little winding stairways, which are concealed in the grottos, give access to this central point of attraction of the building. In these apartments the artist has depicted on the roof and walls the saga of the Aqua Virgo, after Frontinus, as well as the signs of the zodiac, the seasons, and the principal deities of the ancients; the paintings after Frontinus are destroyed, but the others still remain. These are, to a great extent, rather free representations, in the taste of the Renaissance period, which prove, as do the figures of the goddess of love, frequently found throughout the villa, that the austere spirit of the Catholic Reformation had not yet found its way into the court of Julius III.² Very characteristic, too, are the large tablets of marble, let into the reverse side of the fountain-court, bearing two inscriptions in classical Latin, the one containing the regulations for the gardens (*Lex hortorum*) and the other, probably inscribed later, relating to the history of the villa, and the testamentary direction that it is to remain in the possession of the family of the del Monte.³

¹ *Ibid.* 62 n.

² This judgment may appear too severe to some people. All the more do I believe myself justified in repudiating an accusation which, though quite unfounded, has been lately again brought against Julius III. CANCELLIERI (*Mercato*, 269) noted, in his zeal for collecting material, from THEOD. SPRENGER, *Roma nova*, Francof. (1667) 470, the anecdote about the Priapus, which Julius III. had installed at the villa, which BRUZZONE (*Vigna di Papa Giulio: Fanfulla della Domenica*, 1890, n. 23, and *ibid.* n. 33) cites in a very weak essay (*Giulio III.*) as a proof of the paganism of the Pope, although no contemporary mentions anything of the sort. Sprenger, who wrote a full century after the death of Julius III., also gives other anecdotes, the unhistorical character of which is only too palpable.

³ Already published by STERN (*Taf.* 30). LANCIANI (in the *Arch. Rom.*, VI., 230-1) has overlooked this, as well as the publication of both inscriptions by LETAROUILLY (466-7); cf. also CIACONIUS, III., 760, and TESORONI, 43-44.

As in all such country residences, the nymphæum, where the owner could enjoy refreshing coolness during the hot months, forms the most attractive feature of the whole building, and is, accordingly, the most richly decorated part. After having been scandalously neglected for a long time, the nymphæum of the Villa Giulia has been carefully and lovingly restored in recent times, so that one can, at least to a great extent, realize its one-time magnificence. It is true that the figure ornamentation of the building, and the statue of the sleeping Aqua Virgo, the praises of which were sung by the poets of the day,¹ as well as the plane trees which shaded them, are no more, but when it was furnished with costly plants and flowers, and the sparkling waters were in full play, this fountain building must have been a beautiful object, and the same may be said of the whole exquisite villa, even though it was not, as a whole, in perfect unity of style. One can, to a great extent, understand the enthusiasm of the contemporaries who compared the grounds to the gardens of Nero. That is, no doubt, as much an exaggeration as are the 250,000 scudi which the villa is supposed to have cost.² The expenses must, however, have been on a very large scale. Julius is more deserving of blame in having at such a critical period devoted so much money to the erection of a sumptuous building, in which, moreover, ecclesiastical decorum was not always observed, than he was in thankfully retiring, suffering in health as he often was, to his beautiful villa, although this does not imply that he was by any means inactive as far as his duties were concerned.³ As one of the last buildings of this kind, at the end of the Renaissance period, the Villa Giulia clearly shows the worldly tendencies of this Pope, who, though he did not disregard the claims of the

¹ See SAGGIATORE, I., 2, 91-92; *cf.* Anec. litt., IV., 429 *seqq.*, 445 *seqq.* The statue of the Aqua Virgo stood opposite the Caryatides.

² SEGNI, XIII., 829. *Cf.* Lasso's report in DRUFFEL, II., 824; the opinion of a visitor to Rome in 1554 (see ROT., Itin. Rom., 249) which goes to prove that the villa was easily accessible; CONDIVI, lviii.; ADRIANI, VIII., 119-120.

³ *Cf. supra* p. 140.

new age, by no means drew all the inferences which the altered state of affairs demanded.

In accordance with the bad custom of the time, antique building material was greatly made use of in the construction of the Villa Giulia ; it appears from the accounts, that, as in the time of Paul III., the district that was especially plundered, was that of the Aqua Albulae.¹

Valuable discoveries at that time proved the inexhaustible wealth of the soil of Rome in the relics of antiquity. Among these, two are deserving of special mention. In 1551, there was found a superb, but unfortunately imperfectly preserved, example of early Christian plastic art, in the statue of St. Hippolytus, which was afterwards placed in the Christian museum of the Lateran.² In the Via de' Leutari, the celebrated statue of Pompey was found, which the Pope bought for 500 scudi and presented to Cardinal Capodiferro, whose palace, afterwards called the Palazzo Spada, it still adorns.³ Cardinal Ricci also distinguished himself at this time as an indefatigable collector of antiques.⁴ Not a few of these treasures went abroad ; it is related of the ever generous Pope that he gave to Cardinal Guise, who made use of his stay in Rome to collect antiquities with the most ardent zeal, the valuable collection of coins from the legacy of Cardinal Grimani.⁵

¹ Cf. LANCIANI, II., 45, 109-110, 119-120, 132 ; III., 18-19.

² See KRAUS, *Roma Sott.*, 368-9, and *Gesch. der christl. Kunst*, I., 229-230.

³ See HELBIG, *Führer*, II., 170.

⁴ See LANCIANI, III., 106-7. Ricci also collected porcelain during his stay in Portugal, which, as a very rare curiosity, came to Europe at that time from China. In his letters, he says that it comes from the Antipodes ; a small piece cost two, and a fine piece ten ducats ; see MELE, **Genealogia d. famiglia Ricci* (Ricci Archives, Rome).

⁵ Cf. HEULHARD, *Rabelais*, 314. Buonanni *reports on March 8, 1550 : " Il card. Guise attende a buscar più medaglie antiche et più statue che può et fu donato da S.St^a a i dì passati di tutte queste medaglie bellissime, che restaron del card. Grimani ch'erano in castello." (State Archives, Florence).

Vignola remained the official architect of Julius III. during the whole of his pontificate.¹ It is not, however, certain whether he is the creator of the gracefully simple hall with wings on the Capitol, towards Monte Caprino, which still bears the arms of Julius III.² Another task, which is certain to have fallen to the lot of Vignola, was the reconstruction of the palace of the Cardelli family, situated in the Rione Campo Marzo, which received the name of Palazzo di Firenze, after its subsequent possessor, Cosimo de' Medici.

Julius III. had bought this building with the money of the Apostolic Chamber in the first year of his reign, in order to provide his brother Baldovino with a suitable residence of his own. In November, 1552, Baldovino was already living there, but it was a year later that the presentation of the palace and the Villa Giulia was made to him and his heirs.³ The Palazzo Cardelli had in the meantime been completely rebuilt by Vignola. Not only was the pillared courtyard at the entrance enlarged, and the principal staircase embellished, and made more convenient, but a new connecting building between the courtyard and the garden was erected. This part is adorned, on the side of the garden, with a beautiful double loggia.⁴ The interior of the palace was richly and tastefully decorated with stucco ornamentation and frescoes. Unfortunately, sufficient

¹ He bears this title in the account books ; see BERTOLOTTI in the *Atti Mod.* Ser. 3, I., 84.

² Giordani has lately declared himself against the commonly accepted belief that Vignola designed it, in consideration of the style of the building. He is, however, mistaken when he, as well as all the others, including WILlich (p. 68) attributes both pillared halls to the time of Julius III., for the lilies of the Farnese family appear on the hall on the other side towards the Aracoeli.

³ Cf. TESORONI, 31-32, 35-36, 38-39, 89-90.

⁴ Cf. LETAROUILLY, 660, *seqq.*, plate 318-9 ; TESORONI, 36-7 ; WILlich, 70-1 ; FERRI, *La ricostruzione del portico del Vignola nel palazzo di Firenze*, Rome, 1846. GIORDANI (p. 135-6) declares that tradition must be accepted with reserve in this case as well.

research concerning this important work has not been made. Vasari states that Prospero Fontana was engaged upon it ; probably, however, Zuccaro, who nearly always appears in conjunction with Vignola, as well as Primaticcio, co-operated in the work.¹ Besides this palace, Julius III. had instructed Vignola to begin the building of a second one near the Via della Trinità (now del Clementino) the completion of which was delayed by his death. It is evident, from an amusing letter of the Pope to his brother on September 23rd, 1553, that he had personally inspected the beginning of the work.²

The love which Julius III. felt for his family is also shown by the monuments which he caused to be erected to his grandfather, Fabiano, and his uncle, Cardinal Antonio. He chose for these the last chapel on the epistle side of the church of S. Pietro in Montorio. The plans for this pious work, the first artistic undertaking of Julius III. after his election, were furnished by Vasari,³ although the advice of Michael Angelo was also sought. Vasari had proposed Raffaello da Montelupo for the figures on the monuments, but Michael Angelo would not accept him. They were therefore executed by Bartolomeo Ammanati, to whom are also attributed the sturdy boys on the balustrade of the chapel. The paintings and the vaulting are by Vasari, who also executed the picture over the altar, the baptism of the Apostle Paul by Ananias. The two monuments are opposite to one another, and are symmetrically executed in the same form. The sarcophagus, with the recumbent figure of the deceased, is raised on a bold substructure, the statues of Religion and Justice being placed in niches over the tombs. The epitaph for the Cardinal : " The Church, by his death, has lost, as it were, her father," sounds, indeed, rather

¹ See VASARI, VII., 415 ; GIORDANI, 138.

² See TESORONI, 37, 88-9. The care of Julius III. for the preservation of the Papal palace at Avignon, which was sadly in need of repair, is clear from his *brief to Card. Farnese of April 17, 1553 (Arm. 41, t. 68, n. 295. Secret Archives of the Vatican).

³ Cf. his design in the Louvre at Paris, which E. Steinmann is about to publish. Here may be seen the epitaph for Fabiano del Monte, which has now disappeared.

extravagant, but the gratitude of Julius III. here finds suitable expression. Although not without faults, this family monument nevertheless reminds one of a better time, and makes a thoroughly dignified impression.¹

Besides Ammanati, Vasari and Zuccaro, Julius III. employed numerous other artists. Of these special mention may be made of Giovanni da Udine, Daniele da Volterra, Girolamo da Carpi and Pietro da Imola.²

In spite of many signs of decline, considerable artistic activity prevailed at this time in Rome, to which, moreover, many artists from northern countries, and especially the Netherlands, came as visitors. Their stay in Rome proved fateful for many of them, because, on the one hand, they acquired the style then in vogue, and on the other, fell under bad influences. Many, however, as, for instance, Antonio More, the court painter of Charles V. and Philip II., derived great benefit from their sojourn in Rome, and developed into eminent colourists. Jan van der Straet, from Bruges, the friend of Vasari, executed pictures in the Vatican between 1550 and 1553.³

Artistic crafts reached great perfection and flourished during

¹ Cf. VASARI, VII., 226-7, 229-230, 231, 235, 693; FORCELLA, V., 254; NIBBY, Roma, I. (1899), 589; KALLAB, 84, 86, 87, 89; THIEME, Künstlerlexikon, I., 414; REUMONT, III., 2nd ed., 724; ESCHER, Barock, 116. In the July of 1554, Ammanati received the remainder of the payment "della scultura della capella del card. Montalto." (*Intr. et Exit. in the Cod. Vat. 10605 of the Vatican Library). Card. Fulvio della Corgna also found his resting place in S. Pietro in Montorio (see FORCELLA, V., 260). Card. Ricci erected a similar tomb for himself in the chapel opposite that of the del Monte; see FORCELLA, V., 254.

² Cf. VASARI, VI., 478; KALLAB, 84, 86; Atti Mod., Ser. 3, I., 83. Payment for Pietro da Imola in the *Exit. 1551, April 29 (State Archives, Rome).

³ Cf. BERTOLOTTI, Artisti Belgi e Olandesi a Roma nei secoli XVI. e XVII., Florence, 1880, 46-47, 51; V. v. LOGA in the Jahrb. des öster. Kaiserhauses, XXVII., 96-97; HOOGEWERFF, Nederlandsche Schilders in Italie, 142-3, 155-6.

the pontificate of Julius III., as they had done under his predecessor. In the account books, payments to goldsmiths, jewellers, medallists, and engravers frequently appear. One meets here the name of the celebrated Alessandro Cesati, called "il Greco," and of a pupil of Benvenuto Cellini, named Manno Sbarra.¹

If one compares the artistic activity under Julius III. with that under his predecessor, one finds a great disparity between the two periods. The great impetus which Paul III. knew how to give to every enterprise is non-existent in the reign of his successor; apart from the Villa Giulia, few works of importance were executed. This is partly to be attributed to the irresolution of Julius III., and partly to the shortness of his pontificate, but, above all, to his financial difficulties. It was for this reason also that the laying out of the streets² and the works for the fortification of the city, and especially of the Borgo,³ which followed, and which had been begun on a grand

¹ Cf. PLON, Cellini, 393-4; Atti Mod., II., 258; BERTOLOTTI, Art. Veneti, 31 and Art. Lomb., I., 312. Concerning the medals of Julius III. see also L'Arte, X., 137. A well-known artist of the Emilia (cf. MALAGUZZI-VALERI, Lo scultore Prospero Spani detto il Clemente, Modena, 1894) furnished watches. In the *Intr. et Exit. 1554-1555 one also finds Giov. di Prato Tedesco orfice (Cod. Vat. 10605 of the Vatican Library). Cf. the Monatsbericht für Kunstwissenschaft of HELBIG UND SEIDLITZ, I. (1900), 77. The organ of the silver chapel of the Hofkirche in Innsbruck is traditionally considered to be a gift of Julius III.; no proofs of this, however, are forthcoming in the inventories of the archives of the Franciscan Province of the Tyrol.

² Cf. LANCIANI, III., 8.

³ The city walls were not only considerably repaired (cf. NIBBY, Le Mura di Roma (1820), 319, 320, 337, 358; Revue archeol., VII., 129, 130, 136, 138, 232, 234, 237, 336, 339; FORCELLA, XIII., 31; CLAUSSE, II., 351) and restorations undertaken at the Castle of St. Angelo (PAGGLIUCCHI, 122), but the fortifications of the Borgo were also continued. LANCIANI (III., 59) knows of only one document in support of this, that of June 12, 1553. There are, however, others. See the *report of C. Capilupi of March 14, 1553 (Gonzaga Archives, Mantua), concerning the beginning of these

scale by the Farnese Pope, were restricted to very moderate limits. The appearance of the city was very little altered during this pontificate, in all essentials it remained as before. This appearance, however, Rome was not to retain for long, she was to undergo a far-reaching metamorphosis during the latter half of the century. It will, therefore, be in place, at this point, to give some description of the city, as it appeared at the close of the period of the Renaissance.

works in App. No. 19. *Cf.* also PAGLIUCCHI, 124-5; ROCCHI, *Piante*, 68 *seq.*, 78, 214; RAVIOLI, *Notizie sui lavori di archit. milit. dei nove Sangallo*, 15-16. Concerning Jacobo Fusti Castriotto, who was in the service of Julius III. and then served under the Imperialists against Siena, *cf.* Vol., XII. of this work 562, *seq.* Concerning the restoration of the Ponte di S. Maria, which did not resist the inundation of 1557, see FANFANI, *Spigol. Michael Angelo*, 136 *seq.*, Pistoia, 1876. Concerning a medal struck to commemorate the improvement of the port and fortifications of Civitavecchia, see VENUTI, 93.

CHAPTER XIV.

ROME AT THE END OF THE RENAISSANCE PERIOD.

THE Rome of the Cinquecento was surpassed in population by Paris and London,¹ and in beauty by Venice, and perhaps also by Florence. The appearance of the city, crowded together as it was in the low-lying district between the Tiber, the Pincio and the Capitol, and filled with busy traffic, made, with its, for the most part, badly saved and dark crooked streets and its hoary buildings, a decidedly unfavourable impression,² in spite of its numerous palaces and interesting churches. But, taken as a whole, the dwelling place of the Head of the Church, this "world in miniature," was the universal *patria*,³ because

¹ The population of Rome did not exceed 50,000 under Leo X. *cf.* Vol. VIII., of this work, p. 128, n. Under Paul III. the numbers increased, but the 90,000 which RIESS (p. 157) gives for the middle of the XVI.th century is, however, somewhat exaggerated. According to MOCENIGO-ALBÈRI (p. 35) the population under Paul IV., during whose reign many people left the city, amounted to between 40,000 and 50,000, and afterwards increased to about 70,000. Venice with 162,000, London with 185,000, and Paris with 300,000 (see RIESS, 157) were much more populous than Rome. The population of the Eternal City was continually changing, to a remarkable degree, as is stated by MOCENIGO, *loc. cit.*

² MOCENIGO-ALBÈRI (34) expressly declares that the city did not appear very beautiful as a whole.

³ *Cf. ibid.* 31. See also the passage from the treaty of Leo X. with Charles V. (*Urbe quae semper communis patria est habita*) cited by REUMONT in the *Arch. stor. ital.* Ser. 3, IX., 80. On the tombstone in S. Stefano Rotondo of a prelate of Siebenbürgen, who died in Rome in 1523, we read: *Natum quod*

of its historic past, its sacred relics, its artistic treasures, its rare medley of ruins and buildings from classic times, from the Middle Ages and from the Renaissance, because of the austere grandeur of its surroundings, as well as because of the cosmopolitan character of the population which had flocked together from the most different countries to the central point of the Catholic world—a place, in short, which was like no other in the world.

From a number of sources of different kinds, it is possible to form a fairly true picture of the condition of the capital of the world, which had recovered, during the long and peaceful reign of Paul III., from the terrible catastrophe of 1527, and had taken a new lease of life, owing to the improvement of sanitary conditions, the beautifying of the streets, and the awakening of a revived activity in the sphere of building. All this had been continued under the pontificate of Julius III.¹

Besides the Italians, Leonardo Bufalini and Ulisse Aldrovandi, it is specially to two men of northern origin that posterity owes a detailed knowledge of the Rome of the Cinquecento. One was Marten Van Heemskerck, a pupil of Jan van Scorel, who, like so many of his countrymen, came to the Eternal City in 1532, to pursue his studies, and lived there till 1535.² Heemskerck made very good use of his time. A great number of his sketches and drawings have been preserved, and now form a treasure of the cabinet of copper-plate engravings in the Berlin Museum. In this collection there are large and small views of Rome, its hills, ancient monuments, ruins, churches,

gelidum vides ad Istrum—Romana tegier viator urna—Non mirabere, si extimabis illud—Quod Roma est patria omnium fuitque (FORCELLA, VIII., 209.)

¹ Besides AMASAEUS, *Oratio in funere Pauli III.* P.M., Bologna, 1563, and MODIO, *Il Tevere*, Rome, 1556, 7, *cf.* Vol. XII., of this work, p. 566 *seq.* Concerning the increase of prices under Paul III., see LÜTOLF, *Schweizergarde*, 32. Navagero *states on October 30th, 1557, that houses were four times dearer in Rome than in Naples (Court Library, Vienna).

² *Cf.* PREIBISZ, M. v. Heemskerck, Leipsic, 1911, and HOOGEWERFF, *Nederlandsche Schilders in Italie*, 195 *seq.*

palaces, galleries of statues and old gardens, which are, from their accuracy, priceless treasures of the greatest historical and archæological value. Almost always drawn on the spot, they give, with conscientious fidelity, and without additions and embellishment, everything just as it was at the time.¹ Other sketch-books of visitors to Rome, and the copper-plate engravings of the time, afford a valuable supplement to these. Among the latter, the collection of engravings on copper, "*Speculum Romanæ Magnificentiae*," of the enterprising publisher, Antoine Lafréry, who settled in Rome in the middle forties of the XVIth century, takes a prominent place.²

The second northerner is the learned lawyer of Frankfort, Johann Fichard, who, during his residence in Rome in the autumn of 1535, had the happy idea of consigning his varied impressions to writing.³ The hasty notes, written on the

¹ Cf. J. SPRINGER in the *Jahrb. der Preuss. Kunstsamml.*, V. 1884), 327 *seqq.*; XII. (1891), 117 *seq.*, and in the *Stud. zur Kunstgesch. für A. Springer* 226 *seq.*, as well as the critical inventory of MICHAELIS, *Römische Skizzenbücher*, in the *Archäol. Jahrb.*, VI. (1891), 126 *seqq.*; HÜBNER, I., 16, 52 *seq.* A complete edition of the sketch-books of Heemskerck is being prepared by Christian Hülsen and Hermann Egger. Of this magnificent work, which will reproduce 300 sketches in 180 plates in tinted phototype, and among them 20 plates in coloured facsimile, with a descriptive catalogue, I was allowed, through the kindness of the publisher, the use of the first sheets.

² Cf. *Jahrb. des deutsch. arch. Inst.*, VII., 83 *seq.*; v. FABRICZY, in the *Arch. d'Arte*, VI. (1890), 112 *seq.*; EHRLE, *Roma prima di Sisto V.*, 11 *seqq.*, and HÜBNER, I., 15 *seq.*, 34 *seq.*, 69 *seq.*, 57 *seq.*

³ J. Fichard's *Italia* was published by J. C. v. FICHARD in the *Frankfurtischen Archiv für ältere deutsche Literatur und Geschichte*, III. (1815), 1 *seqq.*, with a good introduction, but remained almost forgotten till SCHMARSOW again drew attention to this great source of information in the *Repertorium für Kunstwissenschaft*, XIV., 130 *seqq.*, the reading of which filled me in my early youth with enthusiasm for Rome. Concerning J. Fichard cf. JANNSEN, *Böhmer*, III., 426, and JUNG in the *Archiv für Frankfurter Geschichte*, II. (1889), 209 *seqq.*, and *Allgem.*

spot in Latin, were not intended for publication, whereby their value is notably increased. They by no means belie the dryness of the legal mind, but are, for that very reason, reliable, coming, as they do, from a prosaic observer. Only very rarely does the enthusiasm of the humanist break forth in Fichard's impressions. He feels no tremor of delight at the sight of Italy's splendours, he merely considers them from the point of view of a scholar. His notes are as important as they are interesting, not only for the knowledge of the then condition of Rome which they afford us, but also for the glimpses we get of the opinions entertained at that time. The vagueness of men's ideas as to the remains of antiquity, the preponderance of antiquarian interest over that of the connoisseur of art, several remarkable errors concerning very important works of the Renaissance, all these, even to the use of magical arts to discover the perpetrator of a theft, are admirably characteristic of the knowledge and ideas of that epoch.¹

Fichard remarks that three points of view give the best survey of Rome ; the summits of the Pantheon, the Castle of St. Angelo and the Capitol. He acknowledges that he has never himself got a satisfactory view of Rome, for everything was separated and cut up by hills and gardens. He cites Monte Caprino (what is now considered to be the Tarpeian Rock), which was not then built over, as affording the best general view.² It was just there, where to-day stands the Palazzo Caffarelli, the present seat of the German embassy, that Heemskerck, in the year 1535, sketched his great panorama,

Deutsche Biographie, VI., 757 *seqq.* The manuscript of the *Italia* has disappeared (see JUNG, Frankfurter Chroniken, XX.) which is much to be regretted, especially on account of the sketches added to it.

¹ This magician was a Jew (see FICHARD, *Italia*, 73). BERTOLOTTI treats of "streghe, sortiere e maliardi nel sec. XVI. in Roma," in the *Riv. Europ.*, XXII. (1882), 882 *seq.*; XXIII. (1883), 581 *seq.* Cf. also RODOCANACHI, *Rome*, 342.

² FICHARD, *Italia*, 24, 26, 70.

which has happily been preserved.¹ The value of this lies in the unusually faithful representation of the actual objects, and it is thereby distinguished from all the earlier attempts, which have a traditionally conventional character. The Netherlander has worked with such genuine national assiduity, and with such painstaking accuracy, that one might well describe his panorama as a memorial drawn as a parting reminder of the Eternal City. The more one studies the details, the better does one realize the immense historical value of his sketches. The artist, who has depicted a panorama before the eye of the spectator, begins on the left hand

¹ First reproduced, with introduction by DE ROSSI, in the "Antiken Denkmälern," Vol. II., plate 12, published by the German Archæological Institute. Cf. SPRINGER in the *Jahrb. der Preuss. Kunstsammlungen*, XII. (1891), 123 *seq.*; MICHAELIS, *Römische Skizzenbücher*, 169; DE ROSSI, *Panorama circol. di Roma* (Estr. d. Bull. arch. commun.), Rome, 1892. Similar reproductions in *RODOCANACHI*, Rome, 217, 220. The date on the panorama is not 1534, or 1536, but (according to Hülsen) 1535; in this case one is relieved of the necessity (in contradistinction to van Mander) of prolonging the artist's stay in Rome to four years, instead of three. Concerning the great panorama of Rome, Professor Hülsen kindly informs me that he and Egger have come to the conclusion that it is not the single-handed work of Heemskerck, but owes its origin to a contemporary Dutch artist, whose name he still hopes to succeed in discovering. "This artist," continues Hülsen, "is further represented in the second Berlin volume, as, e.g., by the view of the Forum, reproduced in my *Forum* p. 34, fig. 7, and by the picture of St. Peter's Square, reproduced in *EGGER*, *Römische Veduten*, Plate 19. Apart from the style of the drawing, the difference in the writing is decisive. Heemskerck, when he was in Rome, as his less certain autographs in the first volume prove, wrote in a quite Norse script, whereas the name which was certainly written at the same time by the artist on the panorama approaches the Italian style of writing. Egger wishes to read the date as 1536, of which I am not quite convinced, but that becomes of less importance if Heemskerck is discarded as the author."

with the Aventine, and travels through the west, north and east, returning again to the same hill, at the foot of which one sees the neighbourhood of S. Maria in Cosmedin, the Casa di Cola di Rienzi, the not yet destroyed Ponte di S. Maria (Ponte Rotto) and the harbour full of ships, while in the distance appear the Janiculum, with S. Pietro in Montorio and the twin towers of the Porta S. Pancrazio. In the foreground, we see the citadel of the Savelli, built into the Theatre of Marcellus, arising majestically a little to the right, and behind it the old town with its maze of houses, massive towers and churches. The extensive palace of the Cancelleria, the pointed tower of St Agostino, the flat dome of the Pantheon, the column of Marcus Aurelius (not yet crowned with the statue of the apostle) and the Palazzo di S. Marco stand up as salient points in the distance. The artist has been specially successful in reproducing the manner in which the city is dominated by the Castle of St. Angelo, which is shown as a darkly threatening fortress, on the summit of which floats the large standard of the Pope. The Vatican rises high from out the Borgo, with the venerable pile of St. Peter's and the gigantic construction of the new building of Bramante beside it. Then follows in the foreground, forming the actual central point of the panorama, the Capitoline Hill, shown in profile, and not yet having the form given to it by Michael Angelo. One sees the piazza of the Capitol, with the obelisks and the celebrated palms which stand between the palace of the Senators and the church of S. Maria in Aracoeli. Far away rises the mighty Torre delle Milizie, while farther to the north, in the lonely hill district, which forms a background, appear the basilica of S. Maria Maggiore with the great patriarchal palace, the then very high tower of the Conti, and, only lightly sketched in, the gigantic halls of the Baths of Diocletian, as well as the Lateran. At the feet of the spectator lies the Forum, alive with herds of cattle, with the Basilica of Constantine, the Arch of Septimus Severus, the remains of the Temple of Saturn, the beautiful portico of the Temple of Faustina and Antoninus, as well as the three columns of the Temple of Castor, while to the right we see the mighty mass of the Colosseum, the Arch of

Titus and S. Maria Nuova (S. Francesca Romana). To the east one recognizes, at the foot of the Tarpeian Rock, S. Maria della Consolazione, S. Teodoro and the monuments of the Velabro, while above are the ruins of the Palace of the Cæsars. The Septizonium is also clearly recognizable, as well as S. Anastasia with its campanile and the steps by which people once entered this church. To the right the Aventine, with the battlement crowned fortress of the Savelli, give the finishing touches to this wonderful panorama.

Viewed as a whole, what strikes one most in this picture is the great preponderance of the mediæval character. Not only in the Trastevere, but elsewhere as well, countless towers, with which all the dwellings of the nobles, and especially those of the Cardinals,¹ were provided, rose aloft towards the sky. Square, furnished with loopholes, and crowned with battlements, they are a reminder of bloody times. The highest of these towers are the Torre delle Milizie and the legendary Torre di Nerone, which play such an important part in mediæval views of the Eternal City.² The principal tower of the palace of the Senators on the Capitol, with its loopholes and its turrets at the four corners, still bears the stamp of the XIVth century. In the case of the churches, too, one sees hardly anything but mediæval campanili; the few cupolas which had existed from the time of Sixtus IV. are almost entirely invisible on account of their want of height, whereas it is precisely the

¹ Cf. ALBERTINI, *Opusculum de mirabilibus novae urbis Romae*, ed. Schmarsow, Heilbronn, 1886, 31.

² This tower, built under Gregory IX., frequently changed owners, but again came into the possession of the Conti family in 1546 (LANCIANI, *Il Panorama di Roma delin. da A. v. d. Wyngaerde ca. l'a. 1560*, Rome, 1895, 13, and *Nuova Antologia* 1912, 165 *seq.*) A special work concerning the towers of Rome has yet to be written. Cf. meanwhile ADINOLFI, *La Torre de' Sanguigni*, Rome, 1863; *Giorn. Arcadico*, 1889, II., 282, 373; III., 49; GNOLI, *Roma*, 135 *seqq.*, 138 *seqq.*, 152 *seq.*; DENGEL, *S. Marco*, 76; SABATINI, *La Torre dei Cenci*, Rome, 1906; *La famiglia e le torri dei Frangipani in Roma*, Rome, 1907; *La famiglia e le torri dei Crescenzi*, Rome, 1908.

numerous domes of the baroque period which give the Rome of to-day her special character of stately majesty.

No less astonishing is the smallness of the actual city, in comparison with the immense still unbuilt district with its chaos of ancient ruins, and its lonely dominating basilicas and monasteries. Everywhere this silent region is sharply divided by the shades of a mighty past from the modern city.

This contrast between the inhabited and the uninhabited districts which are enclosed by the Aurelian walls, is also clearly to be seen in the panorama of Hendrik van Cleve,¹ drawn in 1550, and from the large plan of the city, engraved on wood, which Leonardo Bufalini prepared at the end of the pontificate of Paul III., and published in 1551, under Julius III.²

Rome had no central point, for the Vatican, the residence of the Renaissance Popes, as well as the Lateran, the seat of the Head of the Church in the Middle Ages, were situated on the borders of the municipal territory. The Leonine City, or the Borgo, remained under Paul III. what it had been under Julius II. and the Medici Popes, the intellectual quarter, which

¹ Preserved in the Roman *Gabinetto nazionale delle stampe* (F. N. 3379). See BARTOLI in the Bull. arch. commun., XXXVII. (1909), 3 *seqq.*

² Bufalini's plan is of immeasurable value for the knowledge of Roman topography, and gives, besides the plan of Du Pérac, executed in 1577 (ed. EHRLE, Rome, 1908), a clear picture of the appearance of Rome about the middle of the Cinquecento, before the great reconstructions of Gregory XIII. and Sixtus V. We owe a new edition, based on the copy in the Vatican Library, to EHRLE: *Roma al tempo di Giulio III. La pianta di Roma di L. Bufalini del 1551*, Rome, 1911. The comparative lowness of the houses in Heemskerck's panorama is very characteristic of Rome before the Baroque period. The cupola of S. Agostino, e.g. which to-day is almost invisible in a view of the city, in the panorama, as well as in many of the smaller sketches (f. 16: view from the Villa Madama; f. 58^v: panorama from the Borgo) stands up high over the whole Campo Marzo; the same is true of S. Omobono, at the foot of the Capitol, which to-day is hardly to be seen among the surrounding houses.

character had been, once for all, impressed upon it by three mighty buildings, the time-honoured place of burial of the Prince of the apostles, the Castle of St. Angelo and the Palace of the Vatican, which contained the most extensive collection of art treasures. From the Vatican the Rione del Vaticano afterwards took its name, namely that part of the city which was strengthened under Paul III. and Julius III. with new fortifications, and which formed, from the time of Sixtus V., the fourteenth of the districts into which Rome was divided.¹ The principal street of the Borgo, called after its builder, Alexander VI., the Via Alessandrina, now the Borgo Nuovo, praised by Fichard as "a royal road";² Paul III. caused it to be paved. This quarter, which had suffered terribly in the Sack in 1527, had gradually regained its former character and splendour. To the magnificent palaces which had been erected here for Branconio dell' Aquila, and for Raphael, as well as for Cardinals Domenico della Rovere, Adriano Castellesi, Soderini, Pucci and Accolti,³ various new buildings had been added, among which the Palazzo Cesi held a prominent place.⁴ After the death of its founder, Cardinal Paolo Emilio

¹ Cf. MOCENIGO-ALBÈRI, 39; ADINOLFI, La. Portica di S. Pietro ossia Borgo nell'età di mezzo, Rome, 1859; REUMONT, III., 2, 657.

² See the *Taxa per lo matonar la via Alexandrina del Borgo di Roma, dat. October 22, 1544 (Mandat. 1543-1545, p. 195, State Archives, Rome). One can see in the drawing of Giov. Ant. Dosio, reproduced in EGGER, Veduten, Plate 16, what the appearance of the Borgo Nuovo was in 1560. Prof. Hülsen has drawn my attention to the rare and little noticed engraving of Hendrik van Cleve, *Burgus Romae* (in the *Ruinarum varii prospectus* engraved by Theodore Galle) which Dosio amplifies by representing the greater part of the south side of the square about as far as S. Gregorio in Cortina.

³ Cf. Vol. VIII. of this work p. 129 seq., and RODOCANACHI, Rome, 24 seq., 186 seq. Card. Giov. Salviati (died 1553) lived in the palace of Dom. della Rovere (cf. FERRI, 21 seq.) at the beginning of the reign of Julius III., see BUFALINI (B).

⁴ Now the Collegio S. Monica, via S. Uffizio, No. 1, which, in essentials, is fairly well preserved (Cf. GNOLI in the Bull. d.

Cesi, in 1537, this building, which was situated on the left side of St. Peter's, near the city wall, came into the hands of the no less artistic brother of Paolo, Federigo Cesi, who received the purple in 1544. In the Cesi gardens, which Heemskerck sketched, and which every cultivated stranger visited, numerous antiquities were to be seen, as, for instance, the Silenus, now in the Villa Albani, and the two statues of barbarians which were placed in the Palace of the Conservatori in 1720. The altered arrangement of these sculptures which was made by Federigo Cesi, is explained in a description of them by him, composed in 1550. Of the whole collection, the most important private one at the time of Paul III., after that of the Valle, only a few unimportant fragments remain.¹

Fichard describes the Papal palace at the beginning of the reign of the Farnese Pope ; he emphasizes its great extent, for the Vatican consisted of a series of palaces. The entrance to it was in the form of a terrace, in the lower part of which the officials lived and worked ; in the middle storey, officials of a higher degree resided, among them a few Cardinals, as, for instance, Nicholas von Schönberg, in the reign of Paul III. Fichard extols the size of the Vatican, its splendour, and its wealth of loggias, apartments, halls, and the staircases by which one could ascend to the top floors. As the objects of chief interest, he specially mentions the Sixtine Chapel, the wonderfully well-filled library, and the Belvedere, incomparable both from its position and its view, with Bramante's winding staircase and the celebrated gallery of statues.²

Ist. Germ., XX., 276 *seq.*) A *brief of Paul III. to the Doge of Venice, of January 2, 1546, refers to the collection of works of art belonging to Card. Cesi, and speaks of a legacy of coins and a statue of Scipio Africanus in jasper, of which the cardinal was robbed by a legal decision (Arm. 41, t. 35, n. 10 Secret Archives of the Vatican).

¹ See MICHAELIS, *Röm. Skizzenbücher*, 139 *seq.* ; ALDROVANDI, 122 *seq.* ; HÜLSEN-EGGER, I., 14 *seq.* ; HÜBNER, I., 87 *seq.* ; BURCKHARDT, *Beiträge*, 559 *seq.* Concerning Rot's visit see Itin. Rom., 262.

² FICHARD, *Italia*, 47-49.

Fichard's description is the first complete and well arranged account of this world-renowned collection of ancient remains. In one instance, he has observed with even closer attention than Ulisse Aldrovandi, whose statistics, drawn up in 1550, of all the antiquities contained in Rome, is, by reason of its accuracy and reliability, regarded as a most excellent guide.¹ The description of the Frankfort scholar is supplemented by the pen and ink drawings of Heemskerck,² while a picture by Hendrik van Cleve, now in the Imperial Picture Gallery in Vienna, reproduces the grounds of the Belvedere and its adornment with statues in 1550.³

As was the case with the Capitoline collection, a superintendent was also appointed for the Belvedere by Paul III. The magnificent examples of sculpture which Julius II., Leo X., and Clement VII. had collected there, the Apollo, Venus Felix, Laocöon, Cleopatra, Tiber, Nile, Tigris, and torso of Hercules, was enriched by the Farnese Pope with only one really important example, the statue of the so-called Antinous, found in a garden not far from the Castle of St. Angelo in 1543, but which in reality represents Hermes. The remaining antiquities, as numerous as they were valuable, which were discovered during the long reign of Paul III., were destined by him for his family and their palace.

Julius III. had a fountain erected in the vestibule of the Belvedere, where the above-mentioned Torso now stands, which attained a great celebrity, and which formed a most effective ending to the long corridor of Bramante.⁴ He did not enrich the collection himself, as he was too much occupied with the decoration of the Villa Giulia. In spite of this, how-

¹ Delle statue antiche, che per tutta Roma in diversi luoghi e case si vegono di Messer Ulisse Aldroandi, in Lucio Mauro, *Le Antichità della Città di Roma*, Venetia 1562, 115 *seq.* (appeared first in 1556) Cf. *Archäol. zeitung* (1876), 151 *seq.*; BURCHARDT *Beiträge*, 553 *seq.*; HÜBNER, I., 29 *seqq.*

² See MICHAELIS, *Gesch. des Statuenhofes im Belvedere*, 33; HÜBNER, I., 78 *seq.*

³ EGGER, *Veduten*, 33, plate 46.

⁴ MICHAELIS, *Statuenhof*, 37-8.

ever, the gallery of statues in the Belvedere of the Vatican with which Ulisse Aldrovandi begins his well-known description of the antiquities in Rome, was the most important of all the museums of ancient remains.

The Vatican, embellished under Paul III. by the gorgeous Sala Regia and the Capella Paolina, was considered the largest and most beautiful palace in the world. The Venetian ambassador, Mocenigo, who gives this opinion in 1560, compares it to a small town, about which one can with difficulty find one's way, and which it is impossible to describe.¹ It was, however, a great disadvantage for the Papal residence that the air in this district proved unhealthy in summer.² Strangers were allowed to visit the Vatican in all its parts, with that liberality which most of the Popes displayed; when Julius III. was staying at his villa, people were even allowed, under the guidance of an official of the court, to view the magnificently furnished private apartments of the Pope.³

The Loggia of the Benediction, adjoining St. Peter's, which was begun by Pius II. and completed by Julius II., in which the Bull *In Coena Domini* was read on Maundy Thursday, is erroneously described by Fichard as the palace of the Rota, of which he, as a lawyer, gives an exhaustive description.⁴

The Frankfort scholar gives an essentially correct description of old St. Peter's, with its five long aisles; he mentions the broad entrance steps, the wide square vestibule and the atrium, with its fountain (Cantharus) adorned with bronze pine cones and gilded peacocks. There were also fragments of ancient statues here at that time. In the vestibule of this venerable basilica of Constantine, which was still for the most part standing, the marble statue of St. Peter, now in the crypt, and

¹ MOCENIGO-ALBÈRI, 34.

² Navagero emphasizes this in his *reports of August 15, 1556 (St. Mark's Library, Venice).

³ See ROT, *Itin. Rom.*, 258. The Castle of St. Angelo was also then to be visited; *Ibid.* 262.

⁴ FICHARD, *Italia*, 45-47. He has mistaken this for the palace of Innocent VIII., which lies behind it. Concerning the "Loggia della Benedizione" see EGGER, *Veduten*, 24.

Giotto's Navicella, attracted his particular attention. Of the doors which led into the interior of the stately building, the one to the extreme right, the so-called Porta Santa, was only opened in years of Jubilee. The main entrance, with the bronze door, by Filarete, caused Fichard to fall into the error of providing the side entrance also with a door of bronze, whereas, in reality, it only had a carved wooden one, the work of Fra Antonio di Michele da Viterbo,¹ placed there under Eugenius IV.

The interior of the place of burial of the Princes of the Apostles, made holy by a long and glorious past, with its wealth of chapels, altars, mosaics, frescoes and sepulchral monuments, must have filled every visitor with astonishment and admiration. A walk to-day through the crypts of St. Peter's gives some idea of the treasures which had been gathered together there in the course of the centuries.

The basilica formed such a museum of the history of the Church and of art as the world had never seen. Many monuments had been repeatedly changed as to their place. For example, Fichard saw the tomb of the Piccolomini Pope, of such special interest to every German, in the chapel of St. Andrew, then named S. Maria della Febbre. Outside this hallowed spot, in the left hand aisle of the basilica, were the confessionals of the seven penitentiaries, for as many different languages. Opposite, on the right hand wall of the church, one could see Pollajuolo's monument of Innocent VIII., and then the very neglected resting places of the Medici Popes, Leo X. and Clement VII. On the same side was also the celebrated bronze seated statue of St. Peter, which Fichard describes as indifferent, but a very ancient work. The tomb of Pope Nicholas V., with whose accession the Renaissance had ascended the Papal throne, he declares to be superb; it was at that time already within the area of the still unfinished new building. The Doric

¹ FICHARD, *Italia*, 43-44. Cf. SCHMARSOW in the *Repert. für Kunstwiss.*, XIV., 132, 133; see also SPRINGER, II., 2nd ed., 364. See also the description of the time of Pius IV. by O. Panvinio in MAI, *Spic.*, IX., 367 *seq.*

erection at the Tomb of St. Peter, raised under Leo. X., the Frankfort jurist compares to a chapter house, because the throne of the Pope and the seats of the Cardinals were placed there.¹

The days of the old basilica were numbered, on account of the new building begun by Julius II. Several highly interesting drawings by Heemskerck give us an idea of the state of the work at the beginning of the reign of Paul III. ; he reproduces some interesting details with the fidelity and conscientiousness peculiar to him. Several of his sketches are uncommonly plastic in their effect.² Specially valuable is a sketch of the old and new St. Peter's, taken from the south. In this one sees the provisional choir of the new building, and the connecting structure of the arches of the south tribune, afterwards broken up ; the mighty square pillars, with the south and east connecting arches ; of old St. Peter's there are, first of all, S. Maria della Febbre and the Obelisk, still surmounted with a sphere, which stands in its old place alongside the new building, the choir chapel of Sixtus IV., over against which stands the remaining portion of the nave of the old basilica, the front part with its somewhat projecting gable, and, further to the right, the atrium, shut in by the palace of the arch-priest and by that of Innocent VIII., and dominated by the Sixtine Chapel and the top storey of the old Vatican palace. Underneath, the picturesque Leonine belfry and the narrow side of the western galleries belonging to the Loggie of Raphael, still open at that date, appear the Loggia of the Benediction and the front part of the mighty portico of Paul II., with the entrance door to the Vatican erected by Innocent VIII., and close to these the ramparts from which, on festivals, the trumpets were sounded. In the distance one can see the long stretched out

¹ FICHARD, *Italia*, 43-44. Heemskerck sketched the tomb of Innocent VIII. in its old position ; see MICHAELIS, *Röm. Skizzenbücher*, 158.

² GEYMÜLLER, *Entwürfe*, 324, 328, plates 24 and 52. SPRINGER in the *Jahrb. der Preuss. Kunstsamml.*, V., 327, *seq.*, XII.. 118 *seq.* ; MICHAELIS, *Röm. Skizzenbücher*, 136, 155, 163-4. EGGER, *Veduten*, 29 *seq.*, plates 29-34. HÜLSEN-EÜGER, I., 6 *seq.*, 8 *seq.*

gallery of Bramante, the pinnacle-crowned Belvedere, and the Nicchione in its original one-storeyed form.¹ The great interest taken by the artist in the new building is shown by the fact that he made quite a number of further sketches of it. Vasari's fresco in the Cancelleria shows the progress made with the work under Paul III. We can learn from other sketches made about the year 1550, the state it had reached at the end of the reign of the Farnese Pope, and at the beginning of the pontificate of Julius III.²

Fichard praises the square in front of St. Peter's as the finest in the whole city,³ although it was then only half as large as to-day; the obelisk which Sixtus V. placed in the centre was not yet in position, nor were the two fountains or the magnificent colonnade of Bernini. The principal adornment of St. Peter's Square, in which bull-fights were still held in the time of Julius III.,⁴ as was also the case in front of S. Marco and S. Maria in Trastevere, was then the beautiful fountain, begun by Innocent VIII. and completed by Alexander VI.⁵ Rome could not yet point to those incomparable fountains which were later on such a feature of Roman art. Heemskerck has also drawn St. Peter's Square several times, showing the front part of the old building and the Vatican. One of these sketches, lately discovered in the Court library, Vienna, gives an exceedingly instructive picture of the unevenness and difference of level of the square. One can see very clearly in this the difference between the steep ascent which led to the Vatican, and the gentler slope of the ground towards the external flight of steps of the basilica, which had been restored by Pius II., and at either side of which stood the statues of the Princes of the Apostles.⁶

Under Paul III. mercenaries⁷ guarded the entrance to the

¹ EGGER, *Veduten*, 29 *seq.*, plate 29.

² *Ibid.*, 31 *seq.*

³ FICHARD, *Italia*, 42.

⁴ Cf. MASSARELLI, 211, 213, 214.

⁵ Cf. EGGER, *Veduten*, 25.

⁶ *Ibid.* 23 *seq.*, plate 17.

⁷ The "guardia tedescha" as FICHARD calls them (p. 71).

Vatican ; these were first replaced by the Swiss in 1548.¹ The Borgo was very strictly guarded at that time ; Fichard particularly points out that no one was allowed to enter by the Porta S. Petri who had not permission from the guard of the Castle of St. Angelo.² At the other end of the bridge of St. Angelo the statues of St. Peter and St. Paul had been standing since 1530 as the guardians of the Leonine City. It was only after crossing this bridge that one entered the actual city.

The character of the *Rione di Ponte*, of which the river forms the boundary on two sides, is clearly indicated by the first great palace to the right of a person coming from the Borgo. Here, on the banks of the Tiber, lived the noble and artistic banker, Bindo Altoviti, the friend of Raphael and Michael Angelo.³ Besides the banks of the Florentines, among which that of Giovanni Gaddi was pre-eminent, there were also German houses, the best known of which were those of Fugger and Welser. Perino del Vaga had adorned the palace of the Fugger with mythological frescoes.⁴

As Bufalini's plan very clearly shows, the streets leading into the heart of the city from the residence of the Head of the Church, radiated in all directions from the Ponte S. Angelo. On the right side of the bridge, one came, through the new Via Paola, to the national church of the Florentines, built by Jacopo Sansovino, past which the longest and most beautiful street⁵ in Rome at that time, the Via Giulia⁶, laid out under Julius II. by Bramante, and improved by Paul III., followed the course of the river as far as the Ponte Sisto. To the left, the street called after the prison situated there, the Tor di Nona,⁷ also running parallel to the Tiber, formed the connec-

¹ See LÜTOLF, 45 *seq.*

² FICHARD, *Italia*, 50.

³ Cf. Vol. VIII. of this work, p. 120 *seq.*

⁴ See SCHULTE, Fugger I., 201 *seq.* ; SCHMIDLIN, *Anima*, 242.

⁵ So FICHARD calls it p. 25.

⁶ See *Mandata 1539-1542, p. 144 (State Archives, Rome).

⁷ See CORVISIERI in the Arch. d. Soc. Rom., I., 118 ; BARACCONI, *Rioni*, 280 *seq.* ; SIMONETTI, *Vie*, 105-6 ; cf. BERTOLOTTI, *Le prigioni di Roma nei sec. XVI.-XVIII.*, Roma, 1890.

tion with the Corso ; it divided at the church of S. Maria in Posterula, which was built on the banks of the river, into the Via Sistina or del Orso, on the right, which led into the Scrofa, and on the left, into the new Via della Trinità (later Via di S. Lucia, Monte Brianzo, Piazza Nicosia, Fontanella di Borghese and Condotti), which intersected the Scrofa and Corso,¹ and ended in the then unbuilt piazza below the convent of the Trinità de' Monti. To the latter one ascended by a steep path, shaded by trees.

Paul III. had opened out another new street, the Via di Panico, more towards the centre of the city, by which one could reach the fortified Palazzo Orsini on Monte Giordano, from the Castle of St. Angelo ; this palace was inhabited in 1550 by Cardinal Ippolito d'Este.² From the said street, the very busy Via di Tor Sanguigna, afterwards called the Via dei Coronari, from the numerous dealers in rosaries, branched off.³ This busy thoroughfare of Sixtus IV., which, to this day, affords one of the most characteristic street scenes in Rome, with its beautiful, but unfortunately neglected palaces, and its little Quattrocento houses, dating from the time of the first of the Rovere Popes, led to the tower of the Sanguigni and to the Piazza Navona.

The most important and the finest link between the city and the Vatican was the celebrated Canale di Ponte,⁴ which owed

¹ At this spot there stood in the time of Julius III. the *Croce della Trinità*, often mentioned in the documents ; see TESORINI 12, n. 1.

² See BUFALINI (G.)

³ The lower part of this street was called Via dell' Imagine di Ponte (see ADINOLFI, *Via Sacra*, 88) after a picture of a saint, of which Albertus Serra de Monteferrato had the architectural framework renewed by Antonio da Sangallo ; see Arch. d. Soc. Rom., XVII., 445 n ; SIMONETTI, *Vie* 44.

⁴ See ADINOLFI, *Canale di Ponte*, 3 and 46. On Bufalini's plan the street is marked with the name *Forum numulariorum banchii*. The celebrated Contrada de' Banchi was to have been saved, according to the original plan of the reconstructions, but it fell, however, in 1889, when so many other objects of interest in

its name to the fact that, during the frequent inundations, it resembled a canal in the city of the lagoons.¹ An inscription which has survived all the changes of the centuries, still reminds us of the inundation of 1275.² The height to which the Tiber repeatedly invaded the city is also evident from the mark on the church of the Minerva concerning the inundations in the years 1422, 1495 and 1530.³ It was only the great inundations that were commemorated by such records, for lesser ones took place every few years, as may be gathered from the reports of the embassies.⁴ The poorer population in the parts of the city situated close to the Tiber, suffered terribly under these calamities.⁵

In the Canale di Ponte was situated the Papal Mint, or the Zecca, erected by Antonio da Sangallo, and changed by Paul V. into the Banco di S. Spirito, from which comes the present name of Via del Banco di S. Spirito.⁶ At the Zecca the Canale di Ponte branched off into two streets: to the left, the Via dei Banchi Nuovi, with its continuation to the palace of the Massimi, leading past S. Marco and forming part of the celebrated old Via Papale, which ended at the Lateran and thus connected the two principal churches in Rome;⁷ to the

Rome were destroyed under the new government; cf. LANCIANI, *Renaissance*, 279.

¹ Another street, only destroyed with the Ghetto in 1887, was called *Fiumara* for the same reason.

² For the inscription, the oldest of the kind existing in Rome, see GREGOROVIVS, *Gesch. Roms.*, V., 3rd Ed. 147.

³ See Vol. V. of this work, p. 476 *seqq.*, and Vol. X., p. 354. Cf. BERTHIER, *Minerve*, 32.

⁴ Concerning the great inundations in March, 1559, see EHRLE, *Roma di Giulio III.*, 24; for the still worse one of September, 1559, see Vol. XIV. of this work; concerning that of 1551, see *Riv. d. bibliot.*, XVII., 96.

⁵ See MOCENIGO-ALBÈRI, 33.

⁶ See ADINOLFI, *Canale*, 32-3; RODOCANACHI, *Roma*, 189.

⁷ See ADINOLFI, *La via sacra o del Papa*, *Roma*, 1865, and *Laterano e via maggiore*, *Roma*, 1857. Cf. REUMONT, III., I, 439 *seq.*

right of the Zecca one reached the Campo di Fiore and further on the Piazza Giudea, the fortress of the Savelli, built into the Theatre of Marcellus, and the foot of the Capitoline hill, through the Via dei Banchi Vecchi and the Via del Pellegrino,¹ laid out by Sixtus IV. Fichard says that these central streets were the most celebrated and the busiest of all, and that one commercial house joined on to another there.²

This remark of the Frankfort traveller is confirmed by the plan of Bufalini and by that of Ugo Pinardo, made some years later. One can see clearly from these how the whole life of the city thronged to the quarter nearest to the Bridge of St. Angelo, the highway to the Vatican.³ All the rich merchants and bankers, many distinguished prelates and artists, as well as countless rich "cortegiane," lived there. In this neighbourhood the real centre of life in the age of the Renaissance, with all its splendour and all its corruption, was to be found.⁴ Here also were the much frequented inns, such as the Albergo del Leone, in the Via Tor di Nona, and a little further on, the Albergo dell' Orso. This mediæval brick building, in the round arches and ornamentation of which an old-world element makes itself felt, is still in existence, and, although much mutilated and re-built, still serves as an inn.⁵ Not far from

¹ At the beginning of the Via del Pellegrino a secondary street, the Via di Monserrato, branched off to the right of anyone coming from the Castle of St. Angelo, which led across the Piazza Farnese and the Piazza Spada, through the Via Regola and Via Fiumara to the Ponte Quattro Capi.

² FICHARD, 24.

³ See ROCCHI, *Piante iconogr.*, 47; cf. BARACCONI, 121.

⁴ Concerning the scandalous behaviour of the "cortegiane," as prostitutes were then called, and who even carried on their trade in the churches, see, in addition to Vol. V. of this work, 129 *seq.*, TACCHI VENTURI, I., 182, and CALVI in the *Nuova Antologia*, CLII. (1909), 597 *seq.*

⁵ See the article, *Un albergo del Quattrocento*, in the publication "Emporium," XXIII. (1906), 72-73. In 1554, the Salem monk M. Rot put up here; see his *Itin. Rom.* 248. Cf. also NOACK, *Das deutsche Rom.*, 52-53.

the Albergo dell' Orso, the maestro di camera of Julius III., Giovan Battista Galletti, had his dwelling, which was richly adorned with antiques.¹

For the great personages who lived crowded together in the Rione di Ponte, distinguished artists of the Renaissance created palaces in the maze of traffic-filled streets of this Quattrocento quarter, mostly on narrow and irregular foundations, but which were distinguished by their splendour and stately magnificence, and contained countless precious antiques, as did almost all the houses of the upper classes.² Only too many of these buildings, such as the great Palazzo Altoviti, and the elegant house of the Bini,³ have been completely destroyed. Others, as, for instance, the one time cardinalitial palace of Alexander VI., which, in the time of Paul III., was inhabited first by Cardinal Antonio Pucci and then by Guido Ascanio Sforza,⁴ the so-called old Cancelleria (now the Palazzo Sforza-Cesarini) have been disfigured by alterations. Nevertheless, we can still admire in their original beauty, the picturesque Palazzo Alberini-Cicciaporci, a characteristic building of Giulio Romano, and the masterpiece of Jacopo Sansovino, the Palazzo Niccolini-Amici, originally erected for the banker, Giovanni Gaddi, who made it a centre for the artists and humanists of the time.⁵ In the Via Giulia, the severe palatial dwelling (now the Palazzo Sachetti) of the artistic Cardinal

¹ Cf. ALDROVANDI, 186 *seq.* ; HÜBNER, I., 100. The treasurer of Julius III., Francesco d'Aspera, who was also a collector of antiques, lived near S. Macuto ; cf. BUFALINI, ed. Ehrle, 43.

² Aldrovandi knew of above a hundred such houses. There was no palace of importance in which several antique statues, busts, reliefs or inscriptions were not to be found. HÜBNER, I., 74.

³ Cf. Vol. VIII. of this work, p. 120 *seq.* ; see also LANCIANI, Renaissance, 276, 286 ; RODOCANACHI, Rome, 233.

⁴ The Pucci palace is noted on the panorama of Heemskerck (see DE ROSSI, Panorama, 12), G. A. Sforza on Bufalini's plan (G.)

⁵ Cf. LETAROUILLY, I., 14 ; ADINOLFI, Canale, 44 *seq.* ; BARACCONI, Rioni, 269.

Ricci,¹ where Benvenuto Cellini, and, after 1542, Costanza Farnese² lived, is still to be seen.

The dwellings of the Quattrocento, which for the most part had only two windows on each storey and a loggia above,³ are still generally recognizable by the fine and elegantly executed doorways and windows. Not only were the arms of the owner introduced here, but also his name and a motto. Thus one can see on the house of the architect, Prospero Mochi, in the Via dei Coronari (No. 148)⁴ over the windows of the first floor, the name of the owner, and over the doorway, the words: *Tua puta que tute facis* (Thy deeds alone are thy property). The palace of Cardinal Domenico della Rovere (now the Palazzo de' Penitenzieri) has retained the name of this prince of the Church over the windows of the first floor, and over those of the second floor, his "Impresa," *Soli Deo*, which also appears in his Chapel in S. Maria del Popolo. Foreigners also copied this custom of thus distinguishing their dwellings. An example of this is afforded by the house of the Spanish family of Vaca, in the Via della Vignaccia (now del Parlamento No. 60): over the doorway the name of the family is inscribed, and underneath the verse: *Ossa et opes tandem partas tibi Roma relinquam* (My bones and my wealth I shall at last leave to thee, O Rome).

Since the time of Leo X., the exterior of the houses of the better classes had been tastefully decorated with "sgraffiti" and frescoes in one tone, a form of decoration the fame of which reached as far as Poland, and was largely used there. Raphael's pupils, Giovanni da Udine, Perino del Vaga, Polidoro da Caravaggio, Maturino and others produced ex-

¹ Now Via Giulia No. 66; cf. VASARI, V., 466., 489 seq.; LETAROUILLY, I., 92; CLAUSSE, II., 389 seq.; CALLARI 90, seq. RIEGL, Barackkunst, 72; LANCIANI, III., 107; HÜLSEN, Il libro di Giuliano S. Gallo, V.; GNOLI, Roma, 171 and Bollett. d'Arte, V. (1911), 201 seq.; VI. (1912) 12.

² Cf. Massarelli in MERKLE, I., 145; LANCIANI, Scavi, II., 152.

³ Cf. GNOLI, Roma, 156.

⁴ Built by Pietro Roselli; see GNOLI in Associaz. art. fra i cultori di architettura A., 1910-1911, Bergamo, 1912, 70 seq.

quisite works of this kind, which have, unfortunately, almost all gone to ruin, or been defaced until they are unrecognizable. Thus a frieze, which Caravaggio and Maturino painted, showing the history of Niobe, on a palace in the Via della Maschera d'Oro, can hardly be made out. Similar work on a house in the Vicolo del Campanile near S. Maria Traspontina, is in a better state of preservation, but that in the Vicolo Calabraga (now Cellini) is almost faded, while that on that most interesting dwelling of the procurator of the Anima, Johann Sander (Via del Anima No. 65) has been painted over and altered. The frescoes on the Palazzo Ricci give us to-day the best idea of this beautiful street decoration.¹

Giovanni da Udine had in the time of the first Medici Pope, decorated the palace of Giovan Battista Branconio dell'Aquila with stucco, while in other cases they used terra cotta for decoration.² Since the time of Paul III. it had become more and more the custom to adorn the houses with stucco, paintings, reliefs and statues. An outstanding example of this is afforded, in addition to the Palazzo Capodiferro (now Spada) by the still excellently preserved house of the celebrated goldsmith, Gianpietro Crivelli;³ this is situated

¹ Cf. MACCARI, *Saggio di archit. e racc. di decoraz.*, Roma, 1867; LETAROUILLY, I., 110; *Rassegna d'Arte*, V., 97-98; GNOLI, Roma, 159 *seqq.* 164, *seqq.*; RODOCANACHI, Rome, 305 *seq.* and plate 39; HIRSCHFELD, *Zur Geschichte der Fassadenmalerei in Rome*, Halle, 1911. The house on the Via Maschera d'Oro is now No. 7, that in the Vicolo del Campanile is No. 5, and that in the Vicolo Cellini in No. 31. Concerning the house of Sander, the courtyard of which is reproduced in NOACK, *Das Deutsche Rom*, 21, Dr. K. H. Schafer is preparing a special and richly illustrated work.

² The few remains of such ornamentation which are still in existence are cited by GNOLI, Roma, 165 *seq.* A reproduction of the remains on the house in the Via Arco de' Ginnasi No. 23, in STETTINER, 434.

³ Via dei Banchi Vecchi, Nos. 22-24. Cf. LETAROUILLY, I., 99; GNOLI in the *Arch. d'Arte*, VI. (1893), 236, 287 *seq.* Another house with stucco decoration, and with the arms of Paul III., is in the Via Giulia, No. 93.

in the Rione di Ponte, not far from the old confraternity Church of S. Lucia del Gonfalone. Here one can see representations of ancient armour, trophies, coats of arms, lions' heads, genii, garlands of fruit and other ornamentation. Of special interest are the two bas-reliefs, which represent two events in the reign of Paul III. : the reception of Charles V. in Rome, and the conclusion of peace at Nice. Crivelli distinguished himself by his great generosity, and when the Franciscan, Giovanni da Calvi, founded a Monte di Pietà, to combat the usury which was one of the great plagues of the Renaissance period, and which was not practised by the Jews alone, he gave the institution, at that time quite small, but always growing, accomodation in his house.¹

If the Rione di Ponte was especially the home of the bankers and business men, the *Rione di Parione*² was the quarter of the prelates, courtiers, notaries, booksellers, coypists, archeologists and humanists. This quarter contained three open spaces in the Middle Ages, of which the Piazza Parione, near the Church of S. Tommaso, had been built over since the XIVth century,³ while the two others, the Campo di Fiore and the Piazza Navona, are still in existence. Cardinal Estouteville had removed the market in 1477 from the Piazza of the Capitol to the Piazza Navona.⁴ Every Wednesday, as Fichard expressly testifies, the special market for clothing, cloth, arms and other objects, which is now held in the Campo di Fiore, was held in this open space. At carnival time the

¹ Cf. TAMILIA, Il s. Monte di Pietà di Roma, 1900, 24 seq., 101 seq. *Ibid.* 31 seqq., concerning the procession introduced by Julius III., which took place on the 3rd of May every year, and was partially a charitable festival.

² The name, according to LOHNINGER (S. Maria dell' Anima, Rome 1904-3), come from the Parione family.

³ From the documents of the Archives of the Anima, it is evident that numerous ruins of antiquity existed in that neighbourhood, which the members of the Curia bought in order to use them as building material for their houses. (Information kindly given me by the rector, Mgr. Lohninger).

⁴ See CAPOGROSSI GUARNA, I mercati di Roma, Roma, 1873.

former circus of Domitian was the scene of the most brilliant pageants and processions (*fiesta di Agone*), which attracted curious spectators from all parts.¹

On one side of the Piazza Navona was to be seen the Spanish national church of S. Giacomo, while on the other side arose, in the neighbourhood of the German national church, S. Maria dell' Anima, the extensive palace which had come into the possession of Cardinal de Cupis, in which the once powerful but afterwards so unfortunate Cardinal Ascanio Sforza had lived.²

South of the Tor Millina, on which, with its pinnacle adorned with sgraffiti, one could still read the name of the family,³ Cardinal Oliviero Carafa had caused to be erected the statue of Pasquino which was the distinguishing symbol of this Rione. Near the Pasquino, which was regarded by artists as one of the most exquisite examples of sculpture, rose the palace which the artistic Cardinal Antonio del Monte, uncle to Julius III., had had built for himself.⁴ According to Bufalini's plan of the city, the influential Cardinal Alvarez de Toledo⁵ also lived in this neighbourhood. In the Via Parione the

¹ Cf. Vol. XI. of this work, 351 *seq.*

² It is evident from the plan of Bufalini (G) that de Cupis not only possessed the old palace of A.Sforza (*cf.* Nuova Antologia, Ser. 3, XLIII [1893], 434), the Piazza Navona, Nos. 33 to 40, and the Via dell'Anima, Nos. 1 to 11, but also the house of Eck, Via dell'Anima, Nos. 15-18, and Piazza Navona, Nos. 28-29, as well as the two houses adjoining, on the south, Via dell'Anima Nos. 12 to 14, and Piazza Navona, Nos. 30 to 32, which belonged to the Anima. De Cupis wished to appropriate these "vigore bullae Sixti IV" but did not succeed in doing so. On June 3, 1520, "litibus cessit." The Anima then rented both houses to the sister of de Cupis, Francesca de Cupis (uxor Angeli de Bubalis) and her son Cristoforo, first for two years, and later "ad locationem perpetuam"; in 1545 they were sold (Archives of the Anima, Rome).

³ Cf. G. B. GIOVENALE in the Annuario, 1909-1911, Roma, 1911, 127 *seq.* of the Accademia di S. Luca.

⁴ See VASARI, V., 452 *seq.*; TESORONI, 39.n.

⁵ BUFALINI (H).

business house of Antoine Lafréry was to be found, which, until the time of Gregory XIII., was the chief centre of Roman copper-plate engraving.¹ South-west from the Via Parione was situated the Pozzo Bianco (Puteus Albus) which gave its name to the church of Our Lady there. This fountain, which is to-day on the Janiculum, near Tasso's Oak, plays, like the Chiavica di S. Lucia, an important part in the documents of the XVth century, as a topographical designation of the district. The appearance of this neighbourhood was afterwards completely changed by the erection of the magnificent church of the Oratorians, founded by St. Philip Neri.

The Rione di Parione was especially rich in remarkable buildings, which, even though they are, to a great extent, changed, and very much neglected, are still capable of arousing the special interest of the lover of arts. In the Via Parione the portal of a palace erected in 1475, and still adorned with the arms of the family, reminds us of Cardinal Stefano Nardini ; in the time of Julius III., the administration of the " Mons Julii " had its quarters here.² This building, greatly neglected at the present day, was afterwards the residence of the " Governatore " and therefore received the name of Governo Vecchio, after which the street is also named.³ The residence of Cardinal Cortese adjoined the back of this palace. In this building, which is still in existence, was the original home of the hospital of the Germans of Siebenbürgen. It became in 1533, by the presentation of Rosa of Siebenbürgen, the property of the German national church, S. Maria dell' Anima, by which it was sold in 1542 to Cardinal Cortese.⁴

¹ See EHRLE, *Pianta di Roma del 1557*, 11 *seq.* ; *cf.* *Repert. für Kunstwissenschaft*, XXXIII., 402 *seq.*

² This is evident from BUFALINI (G).

³ Concerning the palace see FERRI, 22 *seq.* and CALLARI, 42 *seq.* ; *cf.* LETAROUILLY, I., 19. Description of the beautiful doorway and the characteristic hall in STETTINER, 424-425.

⁴ The donation of Rosa took place on April 19, 1533, the sale to Cardinal Cortese on August 21, 1542 (Archives of the Anima, Rome).

Cardinal Medici, afterwards Pius IV.,¹ resided in 1552 in the palace of Cardinal Fieschi, later called the Palazzo Sora; the elegant residences of the Pichi² and Caccialupi³ families, as well as those of the prelates, Turci⁴ and Thomas le Roy,⁵ are equally well preserved. All these were, however, surpassed in beauty by the Palazzo Massimo alle Colonne and the Cancelleria.

The Cancelleria was, until the completion of the Palazzo Farnese, which does not appear in Heemskerck's panorama, the largest and most splendid building of the new Rome.⁶ Here the powerful and gifted nephew of Paul III., Alessandro Farnese, had his residence, and through him it became, as well as the Vatican, a centre of diplomatic, literary and artistic life. By the side of this enormous erection, which, in the time of Julius III., was still called after its founder, Cardinal Riario,⁷ numerous small houses had been erected. The old basilica of S. Lorenzo in Damaso, which had been incorporated in the Cancelleria, was celebrated, at the time of Fichard's visit, for the masses of the great composers which were sung there daily.⁸

¹ See RODOCANACHI, Rome, 31. Concerning the palace (now Liceo Terenzio Mamiani) see LETAROUILLY, I., 195; CALLARI, 38 *seq.*; GONLI, Roma, 163.

² Piazza Pollarola No. 43; *cf.* CALLARI, 327 *seq.* and GNOLI, *op. cit.*, 279, n. 5.

³ Vicolo Savelli Nos. 44-54. Over the beautiful portal one can see "Johannes Caccialupus." For the adornment of the house with pictures, tapestries and statues see Arch. stor. Lomb., XX., 89 *seq.*

⁴ This house, erected in 1500, now Via Governo Vecchio No. 124, still bears the coat of arms, and on the pediment of the first floor, the inscription of the owner; see LETAROUILLY, I., 13; BELLI, Case abit, in Roma da uomini illustri, Roma, 1850, 54.

⁵ *Cf.* Vol. VIII. of this work, p. 115.

⁶ "Omnium vero magnificentissimum et amplissimum palatium s. Georgii," says FICHARD, Italia, 23. Concerning the Cancelleria *cf.* Vol. VI. of this work, p. 179; and RODOCANACHI, 28-29.

⁷ See BUFALINI (H).

⁸ FICHARD, Italia, 23-25.

In the old Palazzo Massimo, in the back part of which Germans had worked as the first printers in Rome,¹ the numerous bookshelves still retained there in the time of Paul III. were a reminder of the days when scholars used to assemble there to interchange their views.² The original residence of this ancient family had been destroyed in the Sack, but in 1535 Baldassare Peruzzi built a new palace for Pietro Massimo, a truly great work, and wonderfully made to fit in with the curve of the then narrow street. The work of the artist could, it is true, only be fully appreciated by one who was familiar with the former conditions, but even to-day everyone can take pleasure in the pillared courtyard, which, with its little fountain, and the glimpse of the staircase and the loggia on the first floor, makes a particularly beautiful and picturesque whole. All the details of this noble building belong to the best period of the Golden Age.³

In the Rione di Parione were also the houses of the Galli and the Sassi, celebrated for their collections of antiques. Heemskerck in 1535 made pen and ink sketches of the galleries of both and of the statues placed there. One can see from these sketches that the Sassi still possessed the statues which came into the possession of the Farnese in 1546, the Venus Genetrix, the Apollo and the Icarion relief which went to Naples, as well as the Hermes which is now in the British Museum. In the Casa Galli, which was on the north side of the Piazza della Cancelleria, could be seen, among the statues and sarcophagi, the Bacchus of Michael Angelo.⁴

¹ Description in NOACK, *Das deutsche Rom*, 60.

² FICHARD, *Italia*, 24.

³ Cf. BURCKHARDT, *Geschichte der Renaissance*, 52, 104, 106, 205, 298, 323; EBE, I., 25 *seqq.*; RIEGL, *Barockkunst*, 69; RODOCANACHI, 204; HÜBNER, I., 104.

⁴ See SPRINGER in the *Jahrb. der Preuss. Kunstsamml.*, V., 327, 330 *seqq.* MICHAELIS, *Röm. Skizzenbücher*, 141, 153, 170; HÜBNER, I., 100, 114; HÜLSEN-EGGER, I., 16 *seq.*, 39 *seq.*, 42 *seq.* Cf. ROCCHI, 253 *seqq.*, especially concerning the Casa Sassi; *Arch. d. Soc. Rom.*, XX., 479 *seqq.*; HÜLSEN-EGGER, I., 42 *seq.* Some remains of the old house are still in existence in the new building erected in 1867, Via del Governo Vecchio No. 48.

The second great open space of the Rione di Parione was the Campo di Fiore, laid out by Sixtus IV., which was bounded on the south-west by the Rione della Regola. From its central position between this mediaeval part of Rome, which stretched along the Tiber, and the quarters of Parione and Ponte, in which the life of the city pulsated during the Renaissance period, it represented the actual Forum of Rome. The Papal Bulls were affixed there, the regulations of the Governatore published, executions carried out, and the horse market held.¹ On the south-eastern part of this open space the nephew of Eugenius IV., Cardinal Francesco Condulmero, had built a large palace on the ruins of Pompey's Theatre, which later came into the hands of the Orsini, who let it to members of the Sacred College; at the time of Julius III., Cardinal Francisco de Mendoza² lived there. Behind this palace (now the Palazzo Pio) there are two old churches, S. Barbara and S. Maria "in Grotta Pinta." North of S. Maria was the confraternity church of the German bakers, S. Elisabetta,³ only recently destroyed.

In consequence of the busy traffic which centred in the Campo di Fiore, numerous vaulted shops and inns were to be found. The celebrated publishers, Antonio Blado and Antonio Salamanca had their business premises there.⁴ Of the inns, one, the Albergo della Vacca, was part of the extensive property of Vannozza de' Catanei, known from the history of Alexander VI., who also had houses let to innkeepers in other places.⁵ To this day, a Quattrocento building

¹ Cf. FICHARD, *Italia*, 25; GNOLI, *Roma*, 183; RODOCANACHI, *Rome*, 31; see also Vol. VIII. of this work, p. 131 *seq.*

² BUFALINI (H); cf. RODOCANACHI, *Rome*, 31.

³ See DE WAAL, *Campo Santo*, 179 *seq.*

⁴ See GORI, *Archivio IV.*, 225. Cf. concerning A. Blado, *Riv. Europ.*, XXII. (1880), 16 *seq.*; *Giorn. stor. d. lett. Ital.*, XXIII., 307, 328; concerning Salamanca see *Repert. für Kunstwissenschaft*, XXXIII., 402 *seq.*

⁵ Cf. ADINOLFI, *Canale di Ponte*, 13 *seq.*; IMPERI, *S. Maria della Consolazione*, 74; RODOCANACHI, *Rome*, 257; see also FORCELLA, VIII., 520.

close to the Campo di Fiore, in the Vicolo del Gallo (Nos. 12-13) at the corner of the Via de' Cappellari, bears the name Casa di Vannozza. That it belonged to her is clear from the fact that the marble coat of arms affixed to the front of the house shows the bull of the Borgias. It has been believed up till now that this building, which has been preserved with only trifling alterations, is the Bell Inn, which in accordance with the journal of Burchard, was in the later years of the XVth century, the temporary lodging of German princes. The documents in the archives of the Anima, however, show that this house belonged to the Valle, who let it in 1479 to the German innkeeper Johannes Teufel, whom the Italians euphemistically named Angelo; two years later this man bought part of the building.¹ The celebrated Bell Inn, which was a favourite meeting place of the Germans in Rome,² was, therefore not the house of Vannozza, but was alongside it in the Via de' Cappellari. Other Germans carried on the profitable business of innkeeping in Rome during the Cinquecento; in the Borgo there were, as early as the time of Eugenius IV., more than sixty German inns and eating houses.³

The Albergo del Sole, as well as the Bell, had a great reputation in the XVth century, and, although much altered, it still exists at the present day in the Via di Biscione (Nos. 73-76). No one now dreams that this ordinary looking building, with the deep arched entrance and dark picturesque courtyard was once a hotel for foreigners of the first rank, in which the ambassador of France was lodged in 1489.⁴ It is situated where the poultry market (Piazza Pollarola) adjoins the Via di Biscione; here the palace of the Pichi may be recognized by a fine doorway bearing the name of the builder. The

¹ In 1525 the house came into the possession of the Anima; see NAGL-LANG, *Mitteil, aus dem Archiv. des deutsch, Nationalhospizes, Rom.*, 1899, 207; SCHMIDLIN, *Anima*, 107 *seq.*

² NOACK (*Das deutsches Rom*, 51), gives an illustration of the house of Vanozza, but identifies it, as do all the others, as the Bell Inn.

³ See MURATORI, *Script.*, III., 2, 878; GREGOROVIVS, VII.², 696.

⁴ *Ibid.*, VII.², 705; RODOCANACHI, *Rome*, 258.

names of an inn and a street in this neighbourhood remind us still of an old inn named Paradiso, probably on account of its moderate prices. Before the Corso Vittorio Emanuele was laid out one could read at the point where the Via del Paradiso branches off from the Via Papale, the inscription of Girolamo Zorzi concerning the great inundation of the Tiber in the reign of Alexander VI., in December, 1495.¹ The street of the Baullari (trunkmakers), which was appropriately situated in the quarter of the inns, leads to the Palazzo Massimo.

Like the Rioni Ponte and Parione, the *Rione della Regola* contained a large population. As the name Regola (Arenula), meaning sand or gravel, indicates, this was the quarter alongside the Tiber which was crossed by the Via Giulia and a street parallel to it, which went through the Piazza Farnese to the Ponte Quattro Capi. The sharp contrasts, of which the Eternal City offered so many examples, were, perhaps, nowhere more frequent than in this quarter. The huge luxurious palaces were in acute contrast to the little old churches, and the streets filled with people carrying on their trades, the names of which they still retain to the present day: Via de' Cappellari (hat makers), Via de' Giubbonari (doublet makers), Via de' Pettinari (comb-makers).² Many Jews had also settled here, and where they were most numerous, the old palace of the Cenci stood.³ One can best form an idea of the condition of this neighbourhood at that time, for it has been completely changed by the laying out of the Via Arenula, if one enters the dirty Via di S. Bartolomeo de' Vaccinari,⁴ where, above all, a pre-gothic house of the XIIIth century

¹ Cf. Vol. V., of this work, p. 476 *seqq.*

² Certain trades were also carried on elsewhere in special streets, hence Via Coronari (see *supra* p. 372), Via Cartari (papermakers), Via Chiavari (locksmiths), Via Calzettari (shoemakers), Via Pianellari (slippermakers); cf. SIMONETTI, *Vie*, 16 *seq.* We can see what an ordinary street in Rome looked like at that time, from a drawing of Fed. Zuccaro, copied in the *Bullet. d'Arte*, V. (1911).

³ See STETTINER, 443.

⁴ Their Brotherhood, founded in 1552, belonged to the parish church of S. Stefano de Arenula; cf. SIMONETTI, *Vie*, 31.

with a pillared portico attracts the notice of the antiquarian. Such open porticos on the ground level afford welcome protection from rain; they are characteristic of mediæval houses, in most of which a covered loggia was provided.¹ In the porticos antique pillars were often introduced, as in the case of the house in the Via de S. Bartolomeo. Through the last arch of this house one enters the Vicolo del Melangolo, a neighbourhood which represents the mediæval state of the city in a striking manner.²

The Rione della Regola contained three houses for pilgrims: S. Maria di Monserrato for Spaniards, S. Tommaso for Englishmen, and S. Brigida for Swedes. The exiled Archbishop of Upsala, Olaus Magnus,³ lived in S. Brigida, which was in the Piazza Farnese. S. Girolamo della Carità and the church of S. Benedetto in Arenula, which was in the year 1558 given to the confraternity of the Trinità de' Pellegrini,⁴ also belonged to the Rione della Regola.

This quarter had been notably improved when Sixtus IV. had joined it to the Trastevere by the erection of the Ponte Sisto; it received a very great development under Paul III., because the magnificent Palazzo Farnese, begun in 1530 by Antonio da Sangallo, which, in accordance with the will of Paul III., became the property of Cardinal Alessandro Farnese, was situated there. This truly regal building,⁵ of immense size, which was finished as far as the façade on the Via Giulia soon after 1547, was marked on Bufalini's plan as the palace of Paul III. It attained a world-wide celebrity, as much because of the share taken by Michael Angelo in its erection, as because

¹ See GNOLI in the *Nuova Antologia*, CXXXVII. (1908), 678.

² The Vicolo Melangolo, as well as the house Via de' Vaccinari No. 29, are reproduced in STETTINER, 369, 398.

³ See ROT, *Itin.*, 248; BERTOLOTTI, *Artisti Bolognesi*, 27. Concerning O. Magnus *cf.* Vol. XII. of this work, p. 478, n. 2. The archbishop received a monthly income from Julius III.; see **Intr. et Exit.* 1554 in the Cod. Vat. 10605 of the Vatican Library.

⁴ See *Mél. d. Archéol.*, XXI., 481.

⁵ *Cf.* Vol. XII. of this work, p. 579 *seqq.*; see also RODOCANACHI, Rome, 30 *seq.*

of the collection which it contained. Cardinal Alessandro, although he was often in financial difficulties, acquired, in the grand manner of the Medici, treasures of every description: manuscripts, books, and pictures, but above all statues. The latter were partly purchased, and partly obtained by means of special excavations in Rome and the neighbourhood. The Baths of Caracalla afforded the richest finds, for there were brought to light in 1546 and 1547 works of art which threw all former discoveries into the shade. Among these were the group known as the Farnese Bull, the Hercules, the Flora and numerous other valuable pieces of sculpture.¹

Not far from the Palazzo Farnese, near the Ponte Sisto, is the palace of Girolamo Capodiferro (now Palazzo Spada), built in 1540, and decorated by Giulio Mazzoni, a pupil of Daniele da Volterra. The celebrated house of Branconio dell' Aquila, in the Borgo, served as a model for this, the imitation being clearly apparent in the façade, which is almost too richly decorated with statues, stucco and other ornamentation. The decoration of the picturesque courtyard is much more successful. Behind the palace, a garden extends down to the Tiber. Julius III. enriched the collection of the Cardinal by the present of the colossal statue of Pompey.²

The house of the highly respected physician in ordinary to Paul III., Francesco Fusconi of Norcia, was between the Palazzo Farnese and the Campo di Fiore; he too had collected valuable antiques, as the statue of Meleager, now in the Vatican, testifies. Latino Giovenale, another collector of antiquities, also lived in this neighbourhood.³

¹ Cf. LANCIANI, *Scavi*, II., 160 *seqq.*, 181 *seq.*, and *Renaissance*, 125 *seq.* See also Bull. arch. com., 1900, 44 *seq.*, ROCCHI, *Piante*, 252; HÜBNER, I., 96 *seq.* Concerning Card. A. Farnese as a collector, cf. *Nuntiaturberichte*, X., 292, 397 *seq.*

² Cf. VASARI, VII., 70; LETAROUILLY, 243 *seqq.*; BURCKHARDT, *Gesch. der Renaissance*, 200; RIEGL, *Barockkunst*, 68 *seq.*; HÜBNER, I., 85.

³ See ALDROVANDI, 163, 164; MARINI, *Archiatry*, I., 325 *seqq.*; MICHAELIS, *Röm. Skizzenbücher*, VII., 99; HELBIG, I², 75-6; HÜBNER, I., 98, 102.

On the other bank of the river, opposite the Rione della Regola, the *Trastevere*, rich in old churches and towers, which formed a Rione by itself, spread out on all sides. Foreigners seldom penetrated into this part of the city, which was very thickly populated. It was the quarter of the wine-dealers and sailors. The hospital for mariners, as also that for the Genoese, were not far from the venerable church of St. Cecilia.¹ From the harbour on the Ripa Grande, a steep flight of steps and an easy carriage road led to the hall of the Dogana, close to which was the little church of the sailors, S. Maria della Torre, so called after the tower erected by Leo IV. in the IXth century.² The great orphanage of S. Michele rose here towards the end of the XVIIth century.

Almost the whole of this quarter of the city was intersected by a long street, the Via Trastiberina (now Lungarina and Lungaretta) which led from the Ponte di S. Maria (later Ponte Rotto) past the churches of S. Salvatore della Corte and S. Agata, to the piazza and basilica of S. Maria in Trastevere. Right and left of this main artery, which was laid out by Julius II., a maze of dark and tortuous lanes spread out, the most interesting of which have been sacrificed to the embankment of the Tiber. It is very difficult to-day to form an idea of the former state of the neighbourhood. The houses, many of which possessed loggie and small perrons, were nowhere so crowded together as here,³ while among them were numerous small churches and convents, as well as the very substantial dwellings of the old patrician families, such as the Stefaneschi, Ponziani, Papareschi, Normanni, Alberteschi, Mattei, and Anguillara, which were provided with towers, giving them the

¹ See BUFALINI (C).

² See HERMANIN, *Stadt Rom*, 25 and plate 33. Concerning S. Maria della Torre *cf.* also EGGER, *Veduten*, plates 69, 76, p. 38, 40.

³ Only a few are still in existence. *Cf.* Vol. VIII. of this work, p. 132, n. 2. Illustrations of the houses of the XIIIth century opposite S. Cecilia in STETTINER, 401. A very old house may still be seen in the Vicolo della Luce. Concerning the ancient Via Vascellari, which is, unfortunately soon to be destroyed, see ANGELI in the *Giorn. d'Italia*, 1912, n. 207.

appearance of fortresses. The quarter of S. Pellegrino in Viterbo¹ gives us a better idea to-day of the mediæval appearance which the Trastevere presented at the end of the Renaissance period. The numerous towers were specially characteristic, but of these only two have been preserved, the Torre Anguillara² and that of the Gaetani on the island at the Ponte Quattro Capi. Of the citadels of the nobles, the exceedingly interesting dwelling of the Mattei at the Ponte S. Bartolomeo still remains. The very great number of towers, which astonish us in all the representations of the period, gave the name of "De Turribus" to the Church of S. Lorenzo de Janiculo, destroyed at the erection of the Monastery of S. Egidio.³

No part of the city approached the Trastevere in picturesque charm, the Ripa Grande affording a most attractive view from the opposite bank; Pieter Brueghel painted it from there in the year 1553.⁴

Through the porta Settimiana, then recently erected by Alexander VI., went the old road of the pilgrims journeying to St. Peter's, the Via Sancta (now the Lungara) leading to the Porta S. Spirito in the Borgo. Along this road, of which Julius II. intended to form a corresponding street to the Via Giulia, only isolated houses and churches were to be found, for this district lay outside the fortifications. It was the district of the large "vignas," among which those of Cardinals Maffei, Salviati and Farnese were prominent; the celebrated Farnesina of Agostino Chigi also belonged to Cardinal Farnese. Among the churches of the Janiculum, S. Pietro in Montorio goes back to the IXth century, S. Onofrio having only been

¹ Cf. PINZI, *I principali monumenti di Viterbo*, Viterbo, 1894, and EGIDI, *Viterbo*, Napoli, 1912.

² Cf. GNOLI in the review, *Cosmos Cathol.*, 1901.

³ See ASHBY in the *Mél d'archéol.*, XXI., 482. The house of the Mattei (now Ferrini) is in the Piazza Piscinula, Nos. 186-189; several dainty gothic windows and the portal with the arms and the tessellated escutcheon, are still in a good state of preservation.

⁴ See EGGER, *Veduten*, 15, 38, and plate 70.

founded in 1435, by the hermit Niccolò di Forca Palena.¹

Like the Trastevere, the *Rione di S. Angelo* was a real quarter of the people. This was enclosed by the Rioni Regola and S. Eustachio on the west, and by Pigna on the north and Campitelli on the east. Numerous Jews lived here, who, besides extensive money transactions, carried on, even at that time, a business which they have continued to practise in Rome to the present day, that of tailors.² In Bufalini's plan there is a street near S. Angelo in Pescaria, which is designated *Via de' Giudei*. It is clear from Aldrovandi and others that the later Piazza del Pianto bore, in the Cinquecento, the name of Piazza Giudea. In this neighbourhood, the Santa Croce had their palace, which contained numerous antiquities.³ Even as early as the beginning of the Renaissance period the citizens of Rome had made some attempt to beautify this quarter as well, a proof of this being a remarkable building of the Quattrocento in the Piazza del Pianto which has survived all the transformations which this neighbourhood in particular has undergone in recent times. This building is the dwelling, erected in 1467, of Lorenzo de' Manili, who, being an enthusiastic lover of antiquity, connected his houses by a large inscription which runs under the windows of the first floor, and which imitates so exactly the Roman capitals of the best period that it might easily be taken for an antique building. This pompous inscription states that when Rome shall be re-born in its ancient form, he, Laurentius Manlius (he described himself in this way, because he was descended from the celebrated old Roman family) would contribute to the adornment of his beloved native city, as far as his modest for-

¹ Cf. TOMASETTI, *Campagna Romana*, II., 476 *seq.* The vignas on Bufalini's plan (C). Cf. ROT, *Itin. Rom.*, 262. The Vigna Salviati was visited in 1551 by Julius III.; see MASSARELLI, 211.

² Cf. VOGELSTEIN-RIEGER, II., 117 *seq.*; RODOCANACHI, *Rome*, 235 *seq.* A tombstone of 1543 which has been saved from the Jewish cemetery in Trastevere, is now in S. Paolo fuori le mura; see FORCELLA, XII., 15.

³ See ALDROVANDI, 236; MICHAELIS, *Röm. Skizzenbücher*, 141; HÜBNER, I., 113; HÜLSEN-EGGER, I., 17 *seq.*

tune would permit. As a true representative of the Renaissance, he dated the inscription according to the foundation of Rome, and had his name cut in Greek letters on the façade, into which fragments of antique sculpture and inscriptions were introduced. On the sills of the windows towards the Piazza Costaguti one may read the characteristic greeting, expressive of the joy of the builder at the new birth of beauty in the Eternal City: *Have Roma*.¹

The fish-market was held in the Portico of Octavia, near the adjoining church of S. Angelo in Pescaria.² Older visitors to Rome will still remember this exceedingly picturesque—in spite of all the squalor—corner, which has been frequently reproduced by artists.

The most important monument of antiquity in this quarter was the Theatre of Marcellus. This building, owned by the Savelli since 1368, had the appearance of a mediæval stronghold, imparted to it by its earlier owners, the Pierleone, but greatly lessened by the reconstruction carried out by Baldassare Peruzzi. In the arches on the ground floor were the vaulted warehouses of merchandize, which even to this day retain the

¹ The house of Lorenzo de' Manili, whose antiques are praised by Albertini (see HÜBNER, I., 104) now bears the number 18; Gnoli was the first again to draw attention to this extremely interesting building (see Giorn. d'Italia, 1906, n. 36, and Roma, 148, 152 *seq.*; better reproductions in STETTINER, 409). The inscription, not quite accurately published by RODOCANACHI (Rome, 177) is as follows: VRBE. ROMA. IN. PRISTINAM. FORMA [M.R] ENASCENTE. LAVR. MANLIVS. KARITAE. ERGA. PATRI [AM. SVAM. A] EDIS. SV. ||NOMINE. MANLI ANAS. PRO. FORT[VN]AR. MEDIOCRITAE. AD. FOR. IVDEOR. SIBI. POSTERISQ [SVIS. A. FUND.] P. ||AB. VRB. CON. M.M. CC. XXI. L.AN.M.III. D.II. P. XI. CAL. AVG. For good old reproductions of the Pescaria see EGGER, Veduten, plate 52, 53.

² See FICHARD, 25. A reproduction of the fishmarket, completely destroyed in 1878 and 1889 in LANCIANI, Renaissance, II.; cf. BARACCONI, 443; BARTOLI, n. 58; RODOCANACHI, Rome, 261, plate 52.

impress of the Middle Ages.¹ Of the palaces of the Mattei, only one was in existence at that time ; the others, erected under Pius IV., in the Flaminian Circus, have given quite another character to the neighbourhood near the church of S. Caterina de' Funari, built in 1544.

The *Rione di Ripa* followed the Tiber opposite the southern part of Trastevere, the island, with the church of S. Bartolomeo, also belonging to it. In this church, the chapel of the guild of the mill-owners, is still in existence ; one can see on the tombs there, more or less roughly represented, the floating mills which had been anchored not far from the island since the time of Belisarius.² The district of the Rione di Ripa, which was covered with buildings without any open spaces, only reached as far as the Ponte di S. Maria, which, restored under Julius III., was destined to fall a victim to the inundation of 1557, and on the landward side, turned in the direction of the Capitol and the Velabro. Not far from the latter, rose the church of S. Giovanni Decollato, the church of the confraternity which provided criminals with the consolations of religion before their execution. There were nothing but smaller houses near the old basilica of S. Maria in Cosmedin. It was a neglected neighbourhood, where the palace of a noble of the XIth century stood in the midst of indescribable filth ; this was the dwelling of Nicholas Crescentius, the exterior of which was most curiously adorned with antique fragments, and which then bore, as we can see from Heemskerck's panorama, the name of Casa di Pilato, later changed to di Rienzo.³

¹ Cf. HERMANN, 17 and plate 33.

² Cf. RODOCANACHI, Corporations ouvrières a Rome, I., Paris, 1894, 71 seq. ; GREGOROVIVS, I.³, 354 ; BARTOLI, Vedute, c.

³ See FICHARD'S description, Italia, 65 ; cf. LANCIANI, The destruction of Ancient Rome, New York, 1899, 17 ; BARACCONI, 315 ; TOMASSETTI in the Roma Antologia, Ser. 3, Ann. I, 1880. The name Casa di Pilato is connected with the Passion Play (cf. Vol. V. of this work, p. 53 seq.) ; see LANCIANI, Pagan and Christian Rome, London, 1892, 180 seq. A fine old reproduction of the Casa di Pilato in EGGER, Rom. Veduten, plate 55. As a correlative to the Casa di Pilato there was the house of the High

To the south the Rione di Ripa included the whole of the Aventine, the Baths of Caracalla and Monte Testaccio. On the open space in front of the latter the traditional coarse amusements of the Roman populace always took place at carnival time, when the municipal officials and the upper classes would also be present.¹ There were no houses of any kind on the Aventine, with its venerable churches and the picturesque remains of the citadel of the Savelli.

The *Rione di Campitelli*, which extended to the Porta S. Sebastiano, also included a district which was very little built over. In this quarter, to which the Colosseum and the Palatine belong, there was no life except at the foot of the Capitol. The principal remains here were the two churches of Our Lady, S. Maria della Consolazione, with an old picture of the Madonna, at which the many votive offerings and pictures testified to the great veneration in which it was held,² and the church of the Roman Senate, S. Maria in Aracoeli, built on the ruins of the Capitoline Temple of Juno, and with which the wonderfully poetical legend of the appearance of the Queen of Heaven to the Emperor Augustus is associated.³

On the left of the great flight of steps which in 1348 led to the church from the piazza of the Capitol, Fichard saw a considerable number of marble sculptures, several of which have survived to the present day. The church itself, over which the Senate had the right of patronage, was and still is very rich in sepulchral monuments. The Frankfort traveller,

Priest Caiaphas in the Via Bocca della Verità. It reminds us of the Osteria della (*sic*) Caiffa, the name of which Ruffini, in his extremely superficial *Notizie storiche intorno all' origine dei nomi di alcuni osterie* (13) erroneously derives from a former owner. (Information kindly given me by Prof. Hülsen).

¹ Cf. Vol. XI. of this work, p. 356, n. 1; see also BARTOLI, n. 62; GNOLI's essay in the *Giorn. d'Italia*, 1909, n. 53, and G. FERRI in the *Corriere d'Italia*, 1912, n. 48. The Testaccio games were already described in 1404; see *The solace of pilgrims*, ed. Mills, Oxford, 1911, 51 *seq.*

² See FABRICIUS, *Roma*, 247.

³ Cf. HÜLSEN, *The legend of Aracoeli*, Rome, 1907.

however, mentions only the tomb of St. Helena, that of Queen Catherine of Bosnia and the resting place of the humanist, Flavio Biondo.¹

The Capitol, so celebrated on account of the memories associated with it, was visited by all foreigners because of the bronzes presented by Sixtus IV., the She-Wolf, the Thorn Extractor, Camillus, fragments of the bronze Colossus, and Hercules. Under Paul III. it lost the appearance of a mediæval citadel, which it had until then preserved. In an engraving of the year 1538 we can already see the magnificent external staircase which Guglielmo della Porta executed from the design of Michael Angelo, and the statue of Marcus Aurelius so effectively set up in the middle of the square.² The reconstruction of the front of the Palace of the Senators took place soon afterwards, as did that of the porticos at the sides, of which that on the right hand rose during the reign of Julius III.³

On the north, the Rione di Campitelli adjoined the *Rione della Pigna*, which formed a rather irregular square in the middle of the city. This district contained the best preserved monument of antiquity, the Pantheon, called by the people S. Maria Rotonda. The open space in front of it was then much higher, so that one had to descend to the entrance by a flight of steps. Small houses stood round about the building, being even built on to it on the left side. Its condition at that time can be clearly seen from a drawing by Heemskerck. One can here see, behind the point of the gable, the little Romanesque belfry built in 1270; the vestibule is on the left side, and is half walled up; Paul III. was the first to remove this unsightly masonry. The Egyptian basalt lions, afterwards removed to the Vatican, and the magnificent bath of porphyry, which now adorns the tomb of Clement XII. in the Lateran,

¹ FICHARD, *Italia* 30; see also FABRICIUS, *Roma*, 242 *seq.*

² See HERMANIN, plate 5. Cf. Vol. XII. of this work, p. 568 *seq.* Concerning the Capitoline collection of antiques cf. Vol. IV. of this work, p. 459. Cf. also HÜBNER, I., 77, and HÜLSEN-EGGER, I., 29 *seq.*

³ Cf. *supra* p. 351.

stood in front of this exquisite circular building. Small houses had also been built into the splendid ruins of the adjacent Baths of Agrippa.¹

The most important church of the Rione della Pigna was that of the Dominicans, S. Maria sopra Minerva, containing the tomb of St. Catherine of Siena. Against the church stood a library which was of special celebrity,² as was the small, but excellently arranged collection of books belonging to the Augustinians of S. Maria del Popolo. The houses of the Porcari, in the immediate neighbourhood, were rich in antiquities, as well as the Casa Maffei, not far off, near the Arco di Ciambella, in the picturesque courtyard of which Heemskerck saw the statue of the dead Niobe, which afterwards came into the possession of the Bevilacqua, and eventually reached Munich. This collection, one of the oldest in Rome, had already diminished in the time of Aldrovandi. The house was at that time occupied by the eminent Cardinal Bernardino Maffei.³

The little church of S. Giovanni della Pigna, rebuilt by Vittoria Colonna in the piazza of the same name, the Palazzo del Duca d'Urbino⁴ (later Doria) and the Palazzo di S. Marco (now di Venezia) also belonged to the Rione della Pigna. The last-named served Paul III., and also occasionally Julius III.,

¹ Cf. FICHARD, 56 *seq.*; SPRINGER in the *Jahrbuch der Preuss. Kuntssammlungen* 1891, 121 *seq.*; MICHAELIS, *Röm. Skizzenbücher*, 136, 155, 160; BARTOLI, 47; HERMANIN, 15 and plate 18; HÜLSEN-EGGER, I., 7. Concerning the romanesque belfry *cf.* ASHBY, *Un Panorama de Rome par Ant. v. d. Wyngaerde: Mél d'archéol.*, XXI., 481, n. 1.

² See FICHARD, *Italia*, 57, who states: "Praeter Vaticanam bibliothecam istic paucas habet excellentes." FABRICIUS (*Roma*, 207), also mentions especially the libraries of S. Maria in Aracoeli and S. Agostino.

³ See MICHAELIS, *Röm. Skizzenbücher*, 134; HÜBNER, I., 103 *seq.*, 110 *seq.*; HÜLSEN-EGGER, I., 3.

⁴ See ADINOLFI, *Roma*, II., 292 *seqq.*; RODOCANACHI, *Rome*, 34. Cardinal Cajetan had lived in the palace; see *Arch. d. Soc. Rom.*, XVII., 407.

as a summer residence.¹ The mighty building, with its magnificent halls, was excellently suited for the reception of the Pope and his extensive suite. A very special curiosity, which did not escape the notice of Fichard, was the gigantic map of the world at the end of the Quattrocento, which was preserved in the palace and was adorned with reproductions of human beings, and land and sea monsters, and which excited much interest and admiration.² Not far from the monumental building of the Palazzo di S. Marco was the little church of S. Maria della Strada, given to the Jesuits by the Farnese Pope.

The frequent residences of the Popes in the Palazzo di S. Marco gave an importance to the Rione della Pigna, which was separated from the *Rione di Trevi*³ by the Corso (Via Lata), in which the Colonna had their very extensive palace near the SS. Apostoli. The fountain of Trevi still retained the simple form given to it by Nicholas V. A great part of the Rione di Trevi, which reached as far as the Porta Salara and the Porta Nomentana, was uninhabited.

Mighty ruins stood on the Quirinal; the remains of the Baths of Constantine and the Temple of Serapis. In front of the baths, facing towards the piazza, stood the statues of the Horse-breakers, on a clumsy mediæval base; on account of their size and their good state of preservation, they were among the most popular monuments in Rome, and the Quirinal was named Monte Cavallo after them. It was almost entirely taken up with gardens, vineyards, olive groves and villas. Pomponius Laetus and Platina had already laid out villas and gardens on the Quirinal, which was much esteemed on account of its good air. Cardinals Prospero Colonna, Oliviero Carafa and Ridolfo Pio da Carpi had done likewise. The artistic collection of Cardinal Carpi comprised, besides statues and reliefs, small

¹ See DENGEL, Palazzo di Venezia, 96 seqq.

² Cf. DENGEL, Die verschollene *Mappa Mundi* im Palazzo di Venezia zu Rom: Mitteil. der Geogr. Gessellschaft in Wien, LV. (1912).

³ Cf. ADINOLFI, Roma, II., 275 seqq.

bronzes, terra cottas, vases, and antique furniture, as well as books, manuscripts, and pictures. The smaller objects of this collection, of which Aldrovandi gives an enthusiastic description, were almost all in the palace of this Cardinal in the Campo Marzo; the marble statues were nearly all placed in the villa, the extensive gardens of which Aldrovandi calls a paradise on earth.¹

The collection of Cardinal Carpi was, however, surpassed by that of Cardinal Ippolito d'Este, the son of Lucrezia Borgia. This ardent collector of antiquities had filled his residences in the city with treasures of this kind, and since 1554, he had been gradually bringing the most important works of art to his villa on the Quirinal, with the beautifying of which he was still occupied in 1560. This wonderful country house, on the southern slope of the hill, which occupied the site of the grounds of the later Papal palace, was celebrated for the arrangement of the fountains, which were richly adorned with statues.²

Paul III. was specially fond of staying on the Quirinal. He possessed a garden there as early as 1535, which attracted much notice on account of its beauty.³ Later on he lived in the villa of Cardinal Carafa, and it was there that the old Pope of eighty-two breathed his last.⁴ In the gardens of the Colonna near S. Silvestro, Michael Angelo and Vittoria Colonna carried on those conversations on Sunday afternoons which Francesco de Hollanda has preserved for us, and which have been said to have been the last flickerings of the spirit which made the Renaissance great and noble.⁵ Vittoria always had in mind the idea of building a convent of nuns on the ruins

¹ Cf. ALDROVANDI, 201, *seqq.*, 295 *seq.*; LANCIANI, II., 112. III., 176 *seq.*; BARTOLI, n. 88; HÜBNER, I., 85 *seq.* Concerning the Dioscuri see MICHAELIS in the Bull. d. Ist. germ., XIII., 259 *seq.*, and HÜBNER, *Detailstudien zur Gesch. der Antiken Roms in der Renaissance*, Rome, 1911, 318 *seq.*

² Cf. LANCIANI, III., 186 *seqq.*, 191 *seq.*; HÜBNER, I., 90 *seq.*

³ FICHARD, *Italia*, 41.

⁴ Cf. Vol. XII. of this work, p. 452 *seq.*

⁵ KRAUS-SAUER, III., 704, 777.

of the Temple of Serapis, in order that the last remains of paganism might be trodden under the feet of pure-minded women.¹

Towards the north, and round that magnificent relic of antiquity, the column of Marcus Aurelius, and named after it, lay the *Rione di Colonna*.² In the middle of the XVIth century, the ambassadors of France and Portugal had their palaces in this quarter, near Monte Citorio, while the Imperial ambassadors resided in the Palazzo Riario³ (later Altemps) which is still in the Rione di Ponte. Formerly almost all the ambassadors lived in the Rione di Ponte; the transference of their residences into the Rione di Colonna was a sign of the coming change of the centre of life in the city, which was soon to be brought about in an ever increasing degree.

The principal church in the Rione di Colonna was S. Lorenzo in Lucina, which, since May, 1554, had been the title of Cardinal Morone, the largest parish in Rome thereby becoming subject to him.⁴ The palace of Cardinal Quiñones (later Fiano)⁵ adjoined the church; at this point, where until 1662 an ancient triumphal arch, the Arco di Portogallo, spanned the Corso, the fully built over part of this street ended.⁶ Several names still remind us of the end of the houses, such as the Via Capo le Case. To the north the Rione di Colonna reached as far as the Porta Pinciana and the Porta Salara.

Towards the end of the Renaissance period, the Rioni of S. Eustachio and Campo Marzo increased in importance. The *Rione di S. Eustachio*, called after the church of the same name,

¹ Cf. REUMONT, III., 2, 757.

² Cf. ADINOLFI, Roma, II., 335 seqq.

³ See BUFALINI (G). Although the court of the Riario palace is very much altered, the original front and the side towards the Vicolo de' Soldati, with the large tower, which resembles that of the palace of S. Marco, are in a good state of preservation.

⁴ Cf. the *letter of Ippolito Capilupi to Cardinal E. Gonzaga dated Rome, May 10, 1554 (Gonzaga Archives, Mantua).

⁵ Cf. EHRLE, Roma al tempo di Giulio III., 33, n. 14.

⁶ Concerning the state of Corso at that time, cf. LANCIANI in the Bull. arch. comun., 235 seq., and Renaissance, 37 seq., 113 seq.

stretched eastwards from the Rioni Ponte and Parione. The University was situated there, as well as the much frequented church of S. Agostino, and numerous palaces of the Roman nobles. In the neighbourhood of the University, in the Piazza de' Lombardi, there stood, near the venerable church of S. Salvatore in Thermis,¹ the Palazzo Medici, the residence of Leo X. when a Cardinal. In this palace, which came into the hands of the Farnese under Paul III., the unhappy Duke and Duchess, Ottavio and Margherita Farnese, resided from the year 1538, for which reason it was called the Palazzo Madama. Two drawings by Heemskerck give a complete picture of the costly antiquities which the palace contained. Most of these, which were placed there without any special arrangement, were still in the gallery, when Aldrovandi wrote his description of them. The two Aphrodites, the two statues of Bacchus, and the Tyrannicides were placed here, and on the wall of the adjoining garden the Dying Gaul. The Villa Madama, with its collection, which also belonged to the Duchess Margherita, was a possession of inestimable value.²

The palaces of the distinguished family of the della Valle, the members of which had been from early times zealous collectors, contained an even greater number of treasures of all kinds. The gallery of the old Palazzo della Valle, of which the diligent Heemskerck has left us a sketch,³ was adorned by the celebrated statue of Pan, which, while it was in the possession of Leo X., was used for the decoration of the triumphal arch of the Valle, and under Clement VII. was placed in the Capitoline museum, by the side of the Marforio. The principal pieces of sculpture, which had also been used for the said triumphal arch, were placed by Cardinal Andrea della Valle (d. 1534) in his palace close by (now the Palazzo Valle-Rustici-

¹ Concerning this church, only destroyed in 1907, the objects of interest in which were placed in the palace at S. Luigi de' Francesi, see SABATINI, *La Chiesa di S. Salvatore in Thermis*, Roma, 1907.

² See MICHAELIS, *Röm. Skizzenbücher*, 121, 152, 161 *seq.*; LANCIANI, *Scavi*, I., 146 *seq.*; HÜLSEN-EGGER, I., 4-5; HÜBNER, 105, *seq.*

³ See MICHAELIS, *loc. cit.* 158.

Bufalo).¹ This building, the principal entrance of which was adorned by a large head of Zeus, was a real museum. Everywhere, in the entrance hall, in the courtyard, as well as on the upper floors, there were so many marble works of art that the prosaic Fichard cries out in admiration that the real treasures of Roman antiquity were to be found there.² In the quadrilateral court, which had been built for the statues, there were at that time, the Venus de' Medici and the Ganymede of the Uffizi. After the death of the Cardinal, his nephew, Quinzio de' Rustici,³ became the owner of these treasures.

Not far from this magnificent residence, Cardinal Andrea had a new palace built by Raphael's pupil, Lorenzetto, in the present day Piazza di Valle; this had not been completely finished on account of the catastrophe of 1527.⁴ The treasures collected there as well, aroused the admiration of Fichard.⁵ The rarest works adorned the celebrated gallery of statues on the upper floor, the corridors at the sides of which opened on to pillared halls. An engraving by Hieronymus Cock, which he perhaps executed from a drawing by Heemskerck, shows this marvellous hall with its precious contents; a drawing by Francesco de Hollanda, made rather later, gives an exact picture of the right wall. The manner in which antique reliefs, statues in niches, and busts in circular recesses, were arranged, became a model for the whole of Rome.⁶ This new palace was inherited by the Capranica family, whose name it still bears.⁷ They sold the antiques to Cardinal Ferdinando

¹ Now Corso Vittorio Emanuele No. 101, with the inscription "Andreas Car. de Valle" over the principal entrance; cf. LETA-ROUILLY, I., 17.

² Italia, 68.

³ See MICHAELIS, Röm. Skizzenbucher, 235 seq., where the collections of the Valle are treated in a very detailed manner; cf. also HÜLSEN-EGGER, I., 15 seq., and HÜBNER, I., 117 seq.

⁴ See VASARI, IV., 579; cf. RODOCANACHI, Rome, 34.

⁵ Italia, 68.

⁶ See HUBNER, I., 74; cf. BURCKHARDT, Beiträge, 564 seq.

⁷ Via del Teatro Valle No. 16. The site of the gallery of statues is now occupied by the Teatro Valle. The investigator into the

de' Medici in 1584, who used them for the adornment of his villa on the Pincio, but most of them were removed to Florence in the XVIIIth century. In Cock's engraving one can see the Marsyas of the Uffizi, the so-called Thusnelda and the two large clothed statues of the Loggia de' Lanzi, the statue of a barbarian of the Giardino Boboli, and many other masterpieces now preserved in the city on the Arno.¹

Under Leo X. the Rione di S. Eustachio was enriched by two new and imposing palaces: the Palazzo Lante ai Capretari, built by Jacopo Sansovino, and the Palazzo Maccarani, which Giulio Romano designed for the Cenci. The Palazzo Patrizi, situated near the French national church, was also celebrated, as were the Palazzo Caffarelli (Vidoni) and the Palazzo Piccolomini in the Piazza Siena.² Constanza Piccolomini, Duchess of Amalfi, gave up her residence to the Theatines, under Sixtus V., who transformed it into a monastery, alongside which arose the large baroque church of S. Andrea della Valle. The little church of S. Sebastiano di Via Papæ, of which an altar in the new building reminds us, disappeared in the complete reorganization of the district which was undertaken at that time.

The master of ceremonies of Alexander VI., Johannes Burchard, from the diocese of Strasbourg, had built himself a large house in the Rione di S. Eustachio, not far from the Palazzo Cesarini; on the tower of this house one could read the inscription "Argentina," a name which still lives on in the name of the street and theatre there. This house was an exception in the city of the Renaissance, for it was built in the gothic style, as was customary in Germany. Part of it, though in a deplorable condition, can still be seen.³

history of Christina of Sweden, Baron v. Bildt, lives in the palace; he is enthusiastically devoted to antiquity, art and literature.

¹ See MICHAELIS, *Röm. Skizzenbücher*, 225-235.

² See ADINOLFI, *Via Sacra*, 65 *seq.*; CALLARI, 45 *seq.*, 51 *seq.*; TOMASSETTI, *Il palazzo Vidoni*, Roma, 1905; HÜLSEN, *Bilder aus der Gesch. des Kapitols*, Rom, 1899, 8, 29. Cf. also Vol. VIII., of this work, p. 129 *seqq.*

³ Via Sudario No. 45: see GNOLI, *La Torre Argentina in Roma*, Roma, 1908; NOACK, *Das deutsche Rom*, 58 *seq.*; STETTINER, 445.

The *Rione di Campo Marzo* restricted the former Campus Martius to a much smaller space. The central point of this, the most northern part of Rome, which was bounded on the west by the Tiber, and on the east by the Pincio, was that mighty monument of antiquity, the Mausoleum of the Emperor Augustus. It had served the Colonna as a fortress in the Middle Ages, and had been turned into a garden under Paul III. ; the Soderini had laid it out by using the remains of the walls which encircled it, and adorning it with statues in the fashion of the period. The obelisk, found in 1519 near S. Rocco, which had once stood at the entrance of the Mausoleum, lay, broken into four pieces, in the Via di Ripetta.¹

Many foreigners, as the names of the streets prove, had settled in this quarter, on account of the national charitable institutions for the Bretons, the Portuguese, the Sclavonians and the Lombards : S. Ivo, S. Antonio, S. Girolamo and S. Ambrogio (afterwards S. Carlo in Corso). This district had improved a great deal since the time of Leo. X.² Under Julius III. it became still more important, for it was that Pope who had the great Palazzo Cardelli, which had been used by Cardinal Carpi from 1537 to 1547, reconstructed and decorated, to serve as a residence for his brother.³ The celebrated hospital of S. Giacomo in Augusta, the old Benedictine monastery of St. Gregory Nazianzen, S. Maria, SS^{ma} Trinità de' Monti on the Pincio, the burial place of the Rovere, S. Maria del Popolo,⁴ which was filled with the most beautiful works of the Renaissance, all belonged to the Rione di Campo Marzo. The neighbouring gate, by which most of the visitors from the north entered the Eternal City, formed, with the bastions of Sixtus IV., a very picturesque object, as we can see from the sketch of Heemskerck.⁵

¹ See HERMANIN 27, plate 38 ; EGGER, Veduten, I., 20, plate 7.

² Cf. TESORONI, Il palazzo di Firenze, 7, and RODOCANACHI, Rome, 200 seq.

³ See *supra* p. 351.

⁴ FABRICIUS (Roma, 254), says : No church in Rome contains so many marble monuments.

⁵ See EGGER, Veduten, 19, plate 2 ; HÜLSEN-EGGER, I., 6.

The irregular Piazza del Popolo was not yet adorned with the obelisks. Three streets, intersecting the Rione di Colonna, led thence into the city : on the right, the Via di Ripetta, on the left, the Via del Babuino, and in the centre, the Via Lata, or Corso, so called from the races held there in carnival time. These main streets, however, were by no means the busiest ; near the gate the houses were few in number, while to the right and left, garden walls arose. The Via Babuino, named after the Silenus on a fountain, was not built over towards the Pincio. The northern part of the Ripetta is called Via Populi in Bufalini's plan. The small cross-street, joining the Ripetta to the Corso near the Mausoleum of Augustus, received the name of Via de' Pontefici from the frescoes with which the Spanish humanist and poet, Saturnio Gerona, who lived there, had decorated his house. They were portraits of the Popes under whom Saturnio had served during his fifty years residence in Rome.¹

If one looks at the above mentioned districts of Rome, the most astonishing thing is the crowding together of the population in the low-lying neighbourhood of the Tiber. The wide hilly districts to the north and south and east, the Pincio, the Quirinal, the Viminal, the Esquiline and the Coelian, were, like the Aventine, almost uninhabited.² Besides the venerable basilicas, high towers, dating from mediæval times, rose up everywhere, but, apart from monasteries, there were in these neighbourhoods, which seemed consecrated for ever to prayer and seclusion, but few dwelling houses. The principal reason for this is given in a remark of Fichard, which seems very surprising in view of the plentiful supply of water now at the disposal of Rome, but which may be understood if we bear in mind the systematic destruction of the Roman aqueducts at the time of the Sack. The Frankfort traveller says that he saw very few fountains in the whole city. The population had to be content with the water from cisterns and from the

¹ Cf. LOHNINGER, S. Maria dell' Anima, 110 *seq.* Concerning Gerona's benevolence, cf. FORCELLA, VIII., 136.

² Cf. Bufalini's plan ; see also FABRICIUS, Roma, 26.

Tiber, which was daily carried round the city.¹ To what a great extent this was done is evident from the fact that the water-carriers formed a guild of their own (the *Compagnia degli Acquarenari*).² They procured the water at the Porta del Popolo, where it was not yet contaminated, and then left it standing for four or five days. It seems incredible that the water of the yellow Tiber was considered healthy, and was carried about by Paul III. as well as by Clement VII., when they were travelling. The physician, Alessandro Petroni, the friend of Ignatius of Loyola, praises the beneficial effects of the water of the Tiber, in a pamphlet dedicated to Julius III.³

The uninhabited district, which comprised two-thirds of the space enclosed by the Aurelian walls, was full of the magic of past associations. The mighty remains of antiquity, as well as the venerable basilicas and monasteries, dating from the early days of Christianity and from mediæval times, lay scattered in magnificent isolation and picturesque solitude. They formed the chief attraction for the pilgrims, who continued to flock in crowds to the centre of ecclesiastical unity, while the wonders of the old churches did not escape the notice of scholars,⁴ who, however, as well as educated people in

¹ FICHARD, *Italia*, 26 ; see also SCHMARSOW in the *Repert. für Kunstwissenschaft*, XIV., 132, and GNOLI, *Roma*, 189 *seq.* ; *cf.* also FABRICIUS, *Roma*, 165.

² *Cf.* CANCELLIERI, *Sopra il tarantismo etc.*, *Roma*, 1817, 68 *seq.* ; LANCIANI, *Renaissance*, 78 *seq.* ; BARACCONI, 154 *seq.* ; RODOCANACHI, *Rome*, 210, 245.

³ A. Petronius, *De aqua Tiberina ad Julium III. P.M.*, *Romae* 1552. Giovan Batt. Modio, on the other hand, stated his opinion that the water was unhealthy in his now exceedingly rare publication *Il Tevere* (*Roma*, 1556) dedicated to Cardinal Ranuccio Farnese, and he suggested that the Cardinal should lay the matter before Paul IV., and improve it by means of aqueducts (p. 59 *seq.*) The physician Andrea Bacci, however, addressed a memorandum, *Del Tevere* (s.a. later ed. *Venice*, 1576), at the same time to Cardinal Farnese in which he declared the water of the Tiber to be perfectly harmless.

⁴ *Cf.* FABRICIUS, *Roma* 202, 211, 224, 226.

general, were far more attracted by the ancient ruins and buildings, for the study of which the topographical works of Bartolomeo Marliani, of 1544, and of Lucio Fauno, of 1548, gave a great deal of useful information.¹ The ruins of ancient Rome lay quite alone, for the vignas which many Cardinals and nobles had laid out in the hilly districts possessed for the most part only modest country houses, which were only occupied in the autumn. The great ostentatious villas, with extensive grounds, had as yet scarcely made their appearance, and the districts which had been the centre of Republican and Imperial life in ancient Rome, were now occupied by vineyards, gardens and fields, presenting a purely rural appearance, with a desolate area of ruins, of the complete desertion and solemn seclusion of which it is difficult at the present time to form any idea.²

Surrounded in great measure by old plane trees, dark cypresses, lofty pine trees and thick laurels, these old ruins were the delight of artists. The sketches of Heemskerck, as well as many of the later engravings of Du Pérac, afford a picture of indescribable romantic charm.³ In many places the ruins served as warehouses or stables, as does the Sette Sale to this day; the Venetian ambassador, Mocenigo, says that it is wonderful to see how vineyards, gardens and little copses have arisen round the antique arches and buildings.⁴

The ancient buildings presented themselves to the spectator in all their splendour; they were far better preserved than they are to-day, for, in spite of all the destruction of past

¹ The work of Pirro Ligorio, with its wealth of divergent opinions, first appeared in 1553; such ideas, however, had already been prevalent; see EHRLE, *Roma di Giulio III.*, 27.

² The condition at that time can be very well seen on Bufalini's plan, as well as on that of Pinardi. See ROCCHI, *Piante*, 47-48, 85; cf. FICHARD, *Italia*, 24. Bufalini (E) sketches the Vinea Io. Bapt. de Montibus, near the pyramid of Cestius.

³ See DU PÉRAC, *I Vestigi dell' antichità di Roma*, Roma, 1575, and LAFRÉRY, *Specul. Rom. magnificent.*; EHRLE, *Pianta del 1577*, 10 seq., 15 seq.

⁴ MOCENIGO-ALBÈRI, 31.

centuries, many of them still preserved their old marble facing, their columns and other ornamentation. The creeping plants and brushwood, which had taken root wherever the cracks in the brickwork had been laid bare, had contributed slowly but surely to the work of destruction.

Great ruins always have something sublime in their appearance, affecting the spectator no less through the actual mass of stonework than by their appeal to the imagination, which gives a new existence to their former grandeur. Nowhere was such an impressive and affecting picture of the past offered to the traveller as in Rome, by the sight of this world of ancient gods and men lying in fragments. The melancholy which overcomes us "poor sons of a day" at such a spectacle, finds effective expression in the verses with which Joachim du Bellay, in the first book of his "*Antiquités de Rome*" (1558) speaks of the ruins which he had visited.

In singular contrast to the archæological *cultus*, which was so devoted to the worship of the antique, is the ruthless manner in which the ancient buildings were robbed of their marbles and columns during the whole of the Renaissance period, and used as convenient materials for new buildings; in their merciless search for antiquities, much more was destroyed than was ever intended or realized. Very disastrous too were the excavations under the foundations of the ancient buildings. One can clearly see how, in the Cinquecento, the mighty halls of the Baths of Diocletian were undermined and caused to collapse by such excavations. At the beginning of the reign of Julius III., a Sicilian priest had built a little chapel close to these great Baths of the ancient city, but he was driven thence by the vagabonds who used the ruins as a place of refuge.¹ These Thermæ, with their majestic halls, gave Fichard the impression of a row of churches. As a building he considered them worthy of the greatest admiration, but it was rather difficult at that time to determine for what purpose they had been erected.² Great changes were begun in that

¹ Cf. HERMANIN, 19, plate 24; see also Bollet. d' Arte, III. (1909), 364 *seqq.*

² FICHARD, *Italia*, 40.

neighbourhood by the laying out of the villa, the celebrated Horti Bellajani, which owed its origin to the artistic and ostentatious Cardinal du Bellay.¹

The Baths of Titus and the Amphitheatrum Castrense, which served the monks of S. Croce in Gerusalemme as a garden, were, at that time, as the engravings show, in a much better state of preservation than they are to-day. The Colosseum made an immense impression on all visitors to Rome, although the lower storey was still partially buried, up to the capitals of the arches. Fichard describes it as the largest and most beautiful of all the monuments of antiquity; nowhere else, he says, can one realize so well the majesty of the Roman people as in this wonderful work, with the sight of which one can never be satiated. What must it have been, he adds, when it was still in a perfect state, and adorned with all its statues!²

Heemskerck's sketches give a striking picture of the state of the Forum, in which the ruins and columns were half buried in earth and rubbish. They also show how the Arch of Titus was still quite walled in by its mediæval covering, while the Arch of Severus, on the other hand, had all three openings laid open to a considerable depth, but was still crowned by its mediæval battlements. Between the Arch of Severus and the Temple of Saturn, and quite close to the ruins of Vespasian's Temple, stood the old church of SS. Sergio e Bacco, which, more fortunate than others, had escaped destruction at the demolitions of Paul III. in connection with the solemn entry

¹ Cf. NIBBY, *Roma. Parte antica*, II., 802; LANCIANI, II., 138 *seq.*; EHRLE, *Roma prima di Sisto V.*, 33; BARTOLI, 76; BARACCONI, 133; ROMIER in the *Mél. d'archéol.*, XXXI., 27 *seq.* Concerning the entrance portal of the Villa, which has only lately been removed, see *Annuario d. Assoc. artist. fra i cultori di architett. Rom.*, 1908, 58 *seq.*, and *Nuova Antologia*, CXXXVI. (1908), 411 *seq.* Concerning the deer park, which was near the Baths of Diocletian at the time of Leo X., see Vol. VIII. of this work, p. 133.

² See FICHARD, *Italia*, 32, 35; cf. MICHAELIS, *Röm. Skizzenbücher*, 153, 163; HERMANIN, plate 21.

of Charles V. into the city.¹ S. Maria Nuova still had the façade of Honorius III. The building alongside the church was connected with the Palatine by the mediæval fortress of the Frangipani.² Fichard could still admire, in the Basilica of Maxentius, then called the Templum Pacis, one of those immense white marble Corinthian columns, which once stood as the central pillars. He declared this column, which was later placed in front of S. Maria Maggiore, to be the most beautiful in Rome. In the Circus Maximus, which served as a vegetable garden, the arches which supported the tiers of seats were still in a good state of preservation ; the Romans of older times had had warehouses and taverns arranged there, where they could refresh themselves during the summer months.³

With regard to the Palace of the Cæsars on the Palatine, at that time called the Palazzo Maggiore, Fichard acknowledged that he could not form any clear idea of what it once had looked like.⁴ The hill, still covered with mighty ruins, was partly in the possession of monasteries and private persons, and partly without any owner. Everything was much overgrown with shrubs and trees, between which vineyards had been planted in suitable places. In several of the unfenced parts flocks of cattle and sheep were feeding.⁵ An exquisite drawing by Heemskerck gives a very valuable general view of the south-western slope of the Palatine, and the expanse of the Circus Maximus. Heemskerck has also sketched the panorama which unfolds itself before the delighted eye of the visitor to the Palatine, taken from the platform of the Belvedere towards the Colosseum, as well as the picturesque ruins of the Velabro.⁶

¹ See HÜLSEN, *Das Forum*, 2nd Ed. Rome, 1905, 36 *seq.* ; *cf. ibid.* 38 *seq.*, concerning the description which Marliani gave in 1544 of the Forum and its monuments ("an exhaustive and critical piece of work for that period") and the controversy with P. Iigorio in the time of Julius III.

² *Cf.* BARTOLI, n. 4.

³ FICHARD, 34.

⁴ *Ibid.* 37.

⁵ *Cf.* HERMANIN, plate 26.

⁶ See EGGER, *Veduten*, I., 44 47, plates 96, 99, 112, 113.

Excavations had already been begun on the Palatine under Leo. X., and on a more comprehensive scale under Paul III., which were continued under Julius III. Pirro Ligorio describes these as an eye-witness. The transformation, which gave a great part of the Palatine a perfectly different appearance, is chiefly connected with the name of the nephew of the Farnese Pope, Alessandro Farnese having remodelled his vigna built there, and turned it into a magnificent villa. The value the Cardinal attached to this property is clear from the fact that in the document of presentation of his villa near the Palazzo Maggiore in favour of Ottavio Farnese, on April 17th, 1548, he laid it down that it should always remain in the possession of the Farnese family.¹

Of the principal ornament of the Palatine, the celebrated Septizonium, only the east front then remained. Heemskerck repeatedly sketched this last fragment of the gorgeous façade of the palace of Septimus Severus facing the Appian Way, and, conscientious as ever, he has not omitted the little additions made to the building by the Frangipani in the XIIth century.²

The whole neighbourhood of the Imperial Fora, which was essentially altered under Pius V. by the laying out of the Via Alessandrina, afforded until then an exceedingly remarkable spectacle. In chaotic confusion the towers of the Conti, Colonna and Gaetani rose above miserable houses and the massive residence of the Knights of St. John, built in the XIVth century. A much greater part of the Forum of Nerva was then preserved than at the present day ; of the Forum of Trajan, which surpassed all the others in size and splendour, the ruins of the great Exedra were still standing on the southern slope of the Quirinal. Paul III. had uncovered the pedestal of the triumphal arch of the Emperor, and during these excavations the little church of St. Nicholas ad Columnam, built in

¹ Cf. LANCIANI, I., 179 ; II., 34 *seqq.*, 45 *seqq.* ; III., 112.

² See HÜLSEN, *Das Septizonium*. Programm zum Winckelmannsfeste 1886 ; HERMANIN, 22, plates 27 and 30 ; BARTOLI, n. 23-24 and in the Bull. d'Arte, III. (1909), 258 *seq.* ; EGGER, 43 *seq.*, plates 92-94. Cf. also the valuable essay of HÜLSEN in the *Zeitschrift für Geschichte in der Architektur*, V., 1.

the XIIIth century, was pulled down. A row of houses which surrounded the spot, was only demolished in 1812. The church of S. Maria di Loreto, erected by the Guild of Bakers, was not yet completed.¹ In the immediate neighbourhood, in the Macel de' Corvi, Michael Angelo had his modest dwelling and studio; the building was modernized later on, but early in the year 1902, the last remains of the house in which the master lived for thirty years disappeared.²

The traveller who pursued his lonely way through peaceful vignas to the remains of ancient Rome, was reminded at every step of the power which had subdued the pagan, by the churches and monasteries which he met with at every turn. The book of the world's history lay here spread out before him, a striking reminder of the transitoriness of all that is earthly, and of the eternal power of God; the realization of this was intensified as the stillness in which this region was wrapt seemed to grow deeper, the only sound that broke the silence being the Angelus bell at noon and eventide. The solemn influence of the surroundings was still further increased when the pilgrim entered the venerable sanctuaries, each with its distinctive features, where, in the days of primitive Christianity, the martyrs and saints had found their resting place. All these were still untouched by the later, and often so devastating alterations and restorations. With their columns, mostly taken from ancient buildings, their gleaming marble floors, and grave mosaic pictures, they must have been eloquent apologists for the one unchanging Church, which had here, for more than a thousand years, untroubled by all outward vicissitudes, prayed and offered sacrifice as in the days of the Apostles.

Among all the Christian monuments contained in the *Rione de' Monti*,³ none was so venerable and rich in holy and great memories of the history of the Church and of the world, as the

¹ See HERMANIN, 14, plates 15-17.

² It was situated in the Vicolo de' Fornari, No. 212; see LANCIANI, *Renaissance* 185; MACKOWSKY, 249 *seq.*; STEINMANN in the *Deutschen Rundschau*, 1902, May number, 279 *seq.*

³ Cf. ADINOLFI, *Roma*, I., 181 *seq.*

Lateran Basilica, which, as the cathedral of the Bishop of Rome, was named the "Mother and Head of all the churches of the world." From the adjoining palace, the chapel of which, on account of its particularly sacred and important relics, was called the *Sancta Sanctorum*, the Popes of ancient and mediæval times had governed the Christian world; five General Councils had been held there.

The reconstruction begun under Pius IV. in 1560 had not yet destroyed the original form of the exceedingly picturesque palace. It was a very extensive and complicated medley of buildings, designed in a most confused way, which had been collecting there since the IVth century; several drawings of Heemskerck enable us to reconstruct the old palace completely.¹ Even then the building had greatly deteriorated;² the *Scala Santa*, which was connected with the old palace, was on its north façade. On the wide unpaved space there, Heemskerck saw and sketched the statue of Marcus Aurelius, on the base which had been erected by Sixtus IV., and in front of which stood two lions on short pillars. To the left of the north entrance was situated the great Council Hall, with the dainty gothic Loggia of the Benediction, which Boniface VIII. had dedicated in the Jubilee of 1300; to the right was the Baptistery, the entrance to which was opposite to that of to-day.³ In front of the principal façade of the basilica, which had three gothic windows, there was a portico with six columns. The interior of the church, which has since been entirely modernized, caused, in its then intact condition, the great memories of the Middle Ages to pass like living pictures before the mind of the spectator. In the portico were the tombs of Alexander II., John X., John XII. and Sylvester II. In the

¹ Cf. *Ges. Studien zur Kunstgesch. für A. Springer*, 227 *seq.* A model of the basilica and its surroundings was in the Roman Jubilee Exhibition of 1911, which was prepared by A. Consolani from the old drawings and plans, See also LAUER, *Le Palais de Latran*, Paris, 1911.

² Cf. ROHAULT, *Le Latran au Moyen-age*, Paris, 1877, 250.

³ Cf. J. SPRINGER in the *Ges. Studien für A. Springer*, 226 *seq.*; EGGER, *Veduten*, I., 41 *seq.*; HÜLSEN-EGGER, I., 36 *seq.*

interior of the five aisled basilica was the monument of Martin V. Many places showed the traces of the troublous times through which the basilica had passed. Fichard saw, in the beautiful gleaming pavement, which was polished like a mirror, the traces of a conflagration. The learned traveller could still see the "Lex Regia" in the church, and he especially admired the exquisite columns, not yet enclosed in pilasters, as well as the frescoes of Gentile da Fabriano, afterwards completely destroyed.¹

The basilica of S. Maria Maggiore, which formed the central point of the very extensive Rione de' Monti, still bore, at that time, the grave impress of the old days. The large side chapels of Sixtus V. and Paul V. were not in existence, nor were the palatial buildings which form wings on either side of the principal façade, nor the tasteful double portico which Fuga erected between them in 1743. From the summit of the old façade, the mosaics shed their glory on the spectator; these had been executed at the end of the XIIIth century by Filippo Rusutti, to the order of Cardinals Giacomo and Pietro Colonna. The vestibule erected by Eugenius III. was still to be seen, as was the magnificent patriarchal palace, which adjoined the basilica.² Four ancient monasteries, among them that of St. Adalbert, formed a fitting environment for this, the most important of the churches dedicated to Our Lady in Rome. S. Croce also still had its old vestibule at that time, but this, as well as the interior, fell a victim to the reconstructions in the baroque style by Gregorini in 1743.³

The many tombs and inscriptions which covered the walls⁴

¹ FICHARD, 20, 60-61. The interior of the Lateran Basilica (not yet reconstructed) is shown by the fresco of Poussin in the church of S. Martino ai Monti.

² Cf. ADINOLFI, Roma, II., 213 *seq.*; BIASIOTTI, La Basilica Esquilina di S. Maria Maggiore ed il Palazzo apud S.M.M., Roma, 1911, 30 *seq.*

³ Cf. HERMANIN, 34, *seq.*

⁴ Cf. the large collection in Forcella, which is, however, sometimes not quite accurate, and the exceedingly able review of his work by GNOLI in the N. Antologia, Ser. 2, XXIV. (1880), 729 *seq.*

and floor of this, as well as all the other churches of Rome, made a deep impression. The inscriptions told of the never ceasing care which the Popes of all centuries had devoted to the restoration and adornment of the churches of their seat of government with relics and indulgences. The epitaphs, which almost covered the floor, as is still the case to-day in S. Maria in Aracoeli and S. Onofrio, proclaimed the names and deeds of countless distinguished, celebrated, rich or learned men. What a wealth of memories they contain, from the touchingly simple tombstones of the earliest Christian days, to the magnificent marble monuments of the Renaissance, with their elegant Latin inscriptions, partly pious and partly tinged with paganism! A great part of Rome's history, her Popes, Cardinals, prelates, nobles, scholars, poets, humanists and artists was enshrined here. No part of her history, down to that dreadful year of war and pestilence, 1527, and to the restoring activity of Paul III., but had left its traces on these stones. All states, professions and ages were represented here; deep piety, true love, bitter grief, as well as verbosity, offensive vain-glory, and not infrequently comic naiveté—all these found expression here. The numerous tombs of foreigners bore witness to the eminently cosmopolitan character of Rome, the capital of the world. Representatives of all the provinces of Italy, as of all the different countries of Europe, especially of Spain and Germany, were to be found among them.¹

See also REUMONT in the *Arch. stor. Ital.*, Ser. 3, IX., 1, 80 *seq.* As many of these gravestones stood up so much above the floor that walking became exceedingly difficult, Paul IV. ordered that they should be set lower, which order was repeated by Pius IV. and Gregory XIII.; see GNOLI, *Roma*, 100. Concerning the tombs of Rome worthy of note from an artistic point of view, *cf.* GERALD S. DAVIES, *Renaissance*. The sculptured tombs of the 15th century, London, 1910.

¹ Examples in GNOLI in the *N. Antologia*, *loc. cit.*, 732 *seq.* Unfortunately the beautiful tombs of the Renaissance which breathe a Christian spirit are not noticed here. Inscriptions of Paul III. which perpetuated privileges granted to the churches, in

More than by all these memories and treasures of art, however, pious pilgrims were attracted by the graces which they could obtain in the Holy Places, and by the relics which were preserved there. The guide for pilgrims, in which the *Mirabilia Romæ* were set forth, described these in the most complete way. Before everything else came the Tomb of the Prince of the Apostles, St. Peter, the pilgrimage place of the whole world. It was the first spot to which the pilgrims flocked from every land. The pilgrimage to the seven principal churches, for which rich indulgences were granted, was undertaken on a single day.¹ The pilgrim would begin with the church of St. Paul, which was situated far outside the gate of that name. Then came the church of St. Sebastian, on the Via Appia, which was reached by the Via delle Sette Chiese. The opportunity of visiting the neighbouring catacomb² was generally taken advantage of when there. Visits to the Lateran, S. Croce, S. Lorenzo fuori le mure, S. Maria Maggiore, and finally St. Peter's, were also necessary in order to gain the great indulgence. This pilgrimage, always difficult on account of the great distance between the churches, was rendered still more arduous by the bad condition of the roads.³

No pilgrim failed to be present at the great ceremonies, at which the Pope either celebrated himself, or at which he assisted. The Pope himself celebrated regularly at Christmas, Easter, and the feast of SS. Peter and Paul, unless prevented by illness. The splendour and magnificence of Catholic ritual was then displayed on the grandest scale, not only in St. Peter's, but also in all the other principal basilicas. An over-

FORCELLA, I., 167; V., 252. Julius III. also granted similar marks of favour; see *Le cose meravigliose*, 15, 26. Cf. DE WAAL, *Roma Sacra*, Vienna, 1905, 445.

¹ Cf. Vol. VIII. of this work, p. 137.

² See ROT, *Itin. Rom.*, 258; G. Fabricius, who visited Rome in 1542 (see *Allg. Deutsche Biographie*, VI., 510 *seq.* and *Bull. d'Ist. arch.*, XIII., 262), mentions in his *Roma* (p. 214 and 219) among the catacombs accessible at that time, also those near S. Agnese and S. Pancrazio.

³ See RODOCANACHI, *Rome*, 308.

whelming impression was made on all present when the Head of the Church pronounced, on Maundy Thursday and Easter Day, from the Loggia of the Benediction, close to St. Peter's, the solemn Blessing on the city and the world, "Urbi et Orbi." In the Jubilee year of 1550, more than 50,000 persons had flocked together to St. Peter's Square, while in 1554, the number amounted to 30,000.¹

On the Feast of the Annunciation, it had been customary since the middle of the XVth century for the Pope to proceed in solemn procession, accompanied by the Cardinals, prelates, and nobles to S. Maria sopra Minerva, where, after High Mass, in accordance with a foundation of Cardinal Torquemada, poor maidens—there were 150 of them in 1550—received their dowry.² Like their predecessors, Paul III. and Julius III. never failed to be present on the other great feasts of the Church, unless prevented by illness. Above all, they made a special point of never omitting to take part in the procession of Corpus Christi, and at the Requiem Mass on the anniversary of their predecessor's death, which, as well as the Coronation Day festivities, took place in the Sixtine Chapel. They also took part in the ceremonies of Holy Week.³

The affecting solemnities of Holy Week began on Palm Sunday. The Pope, who generally said mass very early in his private chapel,⁴ appeared at nine o'clock in the Sixtine Chapel for High Mass, generally celebrated by one of the Cardinals. Then followed the Blessing of the Palms. The first palm was

¹ See MASSARELLI, 166 ; ROT, Itin., 252.

² See MASSARELLI, 162 ; ROT, Itin., 256.

³ See for the following the *Diaries of the Masters of Ceremonies, Blasius de Martinellis, Johannes Franciscus Firmanus and Ludovicus Bondonus de Branchis Firmanus (Secret Archives of the Vatican, Arm. 12). Much of the information in MERKLE, II., 491 *seqq.*, is taken from L. Firmanus ; *cf.* MASSARELLI, 165 *seq.* ; ROT, Itin., 250 *seq.*

⁴ As was the custom of Julius III. In the case of Paul III. the private mass is not mentioned either on this day or on Maundy Thursday ; a Cardinal celebrated *praesente papa* ; see I. FR. FIRMANI *Diaria, XII., 27.

presented by the Dean of the Sacred College to the Pope, who then distributed palms to the Cardinals, ambassadors, Roman nobles, the Penitentiaries of St. Peter's, his famiglia, and such persons as had gained admission to the ceremony. On the Wednesday, three hours before the Ave, began the so-called *Tenebrae*. In St. Peter's, the Sudarium of St. Veronica was exposed on the morning of this day.

On Maundy Thursday, the Pope said mass very early and gave communion to all the members of his court. At ten o'clock the *Capella Papale* began in the Sistine Chapel. After the High Mass, celebrated by a Cardinal, Julius III., accompanied by all the members of the Sacred College, and many bishops and prelates, bore the Blessed Sacrament to the *Capella Paolina*,¹ built by Paul III. Then followed the reading of the Bull *In Coena Domini* in Latin and Italian, by a Cardinal from the Loggia of the Benediction, and then the great Papal Blessing. Then, in the Hall of Consistory, came the "Mandatum" when the Pope personally washed the feet of twelve poor men. On the same day the Sudarium of St. Veronica was again exposed in St. Peter's. In all the churches of the city there was adoration of the Blessed Sacrament. A German who visited Rome in the spring of 1554, relates how great was the fervour displayed in the adoration of the Holy Eucharist, which was in happy contrast to the indifference and irreverence which had generally prevailed in the golden age of the Renaissance. On this day the "sepulchres" were made the central point of attraction for the faithful, and they were adorned in every possible way, with costly rugs, silver candlesticks, and with countless lights and many-coloured lamps.² This impetus to the veneration of the Holy Eucharist, which was also shown in other places at the period of the Catholic Reformation, Rome owed to the Confraternity of the Blessed Sacrament, which had been founded by Paul III., in 1539, at the instance of the Dominican, Tommaso Stella.³

¹ Under Paul III. the Sacred Host was taken to the *Capella Parva*; cf. MORONI, VIII., 294..

² Cf. ROT, Itin., 251..

³ See TACCHI VENTURI, I., 194 seq..

The solemn and unique ceremonies with which the Church commemorates the death of her Bridegroom, in so affecting a manner, began very early on Good Friday. On this day the Pope personally brought back the Blessed Sacrament from the Pauline Chapel to the Sistine. The singing of the Passion, according to St. John, was followed by a sermon. Immediately afterwards, the intercessory prayers were sung, in which the necessities of all men are remembered. All present took part in the affecting Adoration of the Holy Cross. First of all the Pope approached the Cross, barefooted and divested of all the outer insignia of his high office, then the Cardinals, prelates and ambassadors. The Mass of the Presanctified was celebrated by a Cardinal. On Good Friday evening, the Brotherhood of the Gonfalone had, since the XIVth century, been in the habit of making a procession, carrying crosses, to the Colosseum. In the year of Jubilee, 1550, 1500 men took part in this pious pilgrimage, of whom 335 bore large crosses. The Brotherhood of the Cross, of S. Marcello, also arranged a procession in this year, in which 1200 men took part, many of whom scourged themselves. They all visited the four principal churches prescribed for gaining the Jubilee Indulgence.¹

On the morning of Holy Saturday a Cardinal officiated in the Sistine Chapel in the presence of the Pope. At the Gloria, the music started, and the bells were again rung.² That was the signal for all the churches of Rome to announce the approaching Feast of the Resurrection. The unique impression caused by the wave-like rise and fall of the sound of the bells of every size and depth of tone led Rabelais to make his celebrated comparison of the Eternal City to a chiming island.³

At the celebration of High Mass in St. Peter's on Easter Sunday, the Pope distributed Holy Communion to all the Cardinals, the Canons of the Basilica, the Roman nobles, and whatever princes might be present, as, for example, in 1550, to the Dukes of Urbino and Ferrara.⁴

¹ See MASSARELLI, 166.

² ROT, Itin., 252.

³ Cf. REUMONT, III., 2, 786.

⁴ See MASSARELLI, 166; ROT, 252.

Not only strangers, but the Romans also, flocked in great numbers to the ecclesiastical ceremonies, while in Lent they assisted regularly at the so-called " Stations " in the different churches. During this time, the otherwise so silent Rione de' Monti came to life, all classes hastening to the tombs of the martyrs. During the Renaissance period there were proceedings of a very worldly character here.¹ A remarkable and salutary reaction against such unseemly proceedings in holy places was, however, making itself felt. It was the champions of the Catholic Reformation who, in this also, gave the incentive to improvement.

Long before the Council of Trent had impressed upon clergy and laity what was to be observed in the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass and what was to be avoided, those men, burning with the love of God, who had inscribed the reformation of ecclesiastical conditions on their banners, at the head of whom was Ignatius of Loyola, and, soon in keen emulation of him, the youthful Philip Neri, had devoted the whole of their powers to teaching all, by word and example, how to venerate in a fitting manner the House of God, a thing which had so much suffered in the time of the Renaissance. Whoever visited S. Dorotea in Trastevere, the seat of the Oratory of Divine Love, S. Maria della Strada, the church of the founder of the Jesuits, S. Girolamo della Carità or S. Salvatore in Campo, where Philip Neri lived and worked, or the little churches of the Theatines in the Campo Marzo or on the Pincio, or that of the Capuchins, S. Nicola de' Portiis, on the Quirinal, could not but be deeply moved. Evil-living men of the Renaissance, who visited them out of curiosity, were not infrequently completely converted.² Here were to be found priests who, in their lives, were representatives of that reform that was so longed for and so often

¹ Cf. RODOCANACHI, Rome, 307 seq. A humanist in Rome had made a list of the stations in elegant verse ; see MARUCCHI, Basil. et églises de Rome, Rome, 1909, 63 seq.

² See *Le cose meravigliose di Roma* (cf. *infra*, 422, n. 3), 21 ; CAPECELATRO, 175 seqq., 178 seqq. and especially TACCHI VENTURI, I., 186, seq.

discussed. These little poorly-equipped houses of God were so eagerly sought after that they could no longer contain the multitude of the faithful who flocked there for the masses and sermons. There is still in existence a petition of the time of Julius III., begging the Pope to commission Ignatius of Loyola to build a larger church, as S. Maria della Strada was too small and inconvenient for the great numbers who wished to hear the word of God there, and to receive the sacrament of penance.¹ This was the first step towards the erection of the magnificent church of the Gesù, to which were afterwards added the great church of the Theatines at S. Andrea della Valle, and that of the Oratorians at S. Maria in Vallicella, which were not only of great importance for the religious life of Rome, but were also a notable addition to the beauty of the city.

For all the ceremonial of the Church which was conducted by the Pope in person, or in his presence, very strict regulations, going into the minutest details, had been fixed from time immemorial, and the exact carrying out of these was carefully watched over by the master of ceremonies. The pomp which was displayed on these solemn occasions by Paul III. and Julius III., found a fitting setting in the majestic music which accompanied them. A German who spent Holy Week and Easter in Rome in 1554, points out that, in this respect, most wonderful effects were obtained, both in the Lateran and at St. Peter's, where Palestrina was choirmaster.²

Not only the church festivals, but the churches themselves made a deep impression on all strangers. It is noteworthy that Fichard, despite all his enthusiasm for antiquity, names, as the principal objects of interest in the Eternal City, the Vatican, with the Library and the Belvedere, the Cancelleria, the Basilica of St. Peter, the Lateran, S. Paul fuori le Mura, S. Maria Maggiore, S. Maria sopra Minerva, S. Maria del Popolo, and the German national church, S. Maria dell' Anima, with the beautiful tomb of Adrian VI.³

¹ Cf. Studi e docum., XX. (1899), 345 *seqq.*

² See ROT, Itin., 250, 252, 261.

³ FICHARD, Italia, 67.

Eight years after the visit of the Frankfort traveller, an unknown Florentine pilgrim to Rome wrote some notes concerning the principal creations of Renaissance art which were then to be seen in the Eternal City. These remarks,¹ which are interesting from several points of view, begin with the Basilica of the Prince of the Apostles, and its reconstruction. The anonymous writer particularly praises, among the works of art in the basilica, the Pietà of Michael Angelo, which had been placed in the Oratory of St. Gregory after the demolition of the chapel of St. Petronilla.² Of the remaining monuments in St. Peter's, only the tombs of Sixtus IV. and Innocent VIII. are mentioned. The Stanze and the Loggie of Raphael, then still in all the fresh glory of their colouring, and the Sistine Chapel, with its incomparable frescoes, he cites as the most remarkable objects of interest in the Vatican. He complains, with justice, of the destruction of Fra Angelico's Chapel of the Blessed Sacrament. Among the churches, he only mentions those which contained prominent examples of Renaissance art. At S. Agostino, besides Raphael's Isaias, the Madonna del Parto, by Jacopo Sansovino, and the marble group, representing Our Lady, St. Anne, and the Divine Child by Andrea Sansovino, were regarded, even at that time, as objects of the greatest interest. The former stands to-day to the right of the entrance, and the latter on the left side, at the third column, under the Isaias. The Florentine praises the Sybils of Raphael, in S. Maria della Pace, as one of the most beautiful of that painter's works in Rome. He also mentions Baldassare Peruzzi's Presentation in the Temple, which was not then repainted to such an extent as it is to-day. Of the many splendid marble tombs in S. Maria del Popolo, he only speaks of the two largest and most beautiful: the monuments of Cardinals Girolamo Basso and Ascanio Maria Sforza, by

¹ Published and explained by FABRICZY in the Arch. Stor. Ital., Ser. 5, XII., 275 *seq.*, 328 *seq.*

² Cf. MACKOWSKY, 366 *seq.* The Madonna della Febbre was not erected here in 1545, but as early as 1542; see FABRICIUS, Roma, 248.

Andrea Sansovino. Very remarkably, he omits all mention of Pinturricchio's frescoes on the ceiling of the choir, or of the glass paintings of Claude and Guillaume Marcillat, and even of the wonderful Chigi chapel. On the other hand he tells us of the two pictures by Raphael : the Madonna di Loreto, which afterwards disappeared, and the celebrated portrait of Julius II., which now adorns the Uffizi ; both of these were at that time, hung on the pillars of the church on solemn occasions. In S. Maria in Aracoeli, he admired Raphael's Madonna di Foligno, and in the church of the Dominicans, S. Maria sopra Minerva, he makes mention of Filippo Lippi's frescoes in the Carafa chapel, and Michael Angelo's statue of Christ, as the principal works of art there. The tombs of Leo X. and Clement VII. are mentioned, but, as may easily be understood, not praised. Of the Moses of Michael Angelo in S. Pietro in Vincoli the Florentine says that it appears to him to be a "divine" work. He also makes mention of the tombs of Pietro and Antonio Pollajuolo in the same church. The statue of St. James, by Jacopo Sansovino was at that time in the Spanish national church of S. Giacomo, and is now in S. Maria in Monserrato.

Among the works of art in the city on the other side of the Tiber, the Florentine extols the fresco decoration of the Farnesina and the incomparable Tempietto of Bramante in S. Pietro in Montorio. In this church, Raphael's Transfiguration still adorned the high altar at that time. He was also still able to admire in the same church, besides Sebastiano del Piombo's fresco, the Scourging at the Pillar, which is still preserved, the adjoining picture of St. Francis by Michael Angelo, which afterwards disappeared.

Just as the Florentine traveller only cites works of the Renaissance, so does Ulisse Aldrovandi confine himself almost exclusively to the works of antiquity in his account, drawn up in 1550. Of the modern works of sculpture, he mentions only a few, principally some works of Michael Angelo, to whose Moses he believes he is giving the highest possible praise when he says that it could take its place by the side of any ancient

work of art.¹ One looks in vain for the name of any other modern master in Aldrovandi's list. How little he values them in comparison with the sculptors of antiquity is evident from such remarks as : " A Mercury with a lyre, a beautiful statue, but modern." " A female figure, with bare breast, but a modern work." One learns even less from the descriptions of the Bolognese scholar concerning Rome's wealth of paintings, or of the many costly treasures which the palaces of the nobles, and, above all, of the Cardinals, contained.²

How much the interest of most people was captivated by the works of antiquity, is apparent in the guide-books of the time, where most of the space is invariably devoted to these, the details concerning mediæval objects of interest being mostly confined to lists of the relics and indulgences of the different churches. In one such guide-book of the year 1563,³ an estimate of the time necessary for a visit to the principal objects of interest in Rome is given, which is very characteristic. The arrangement for a three days' visit is for a stranger who starts very early, and has a horse at his disposal. The Borgo is taken as a starting point for the first day, after which the Trastevere, the island in the Tiber, Monte Testaccio, S. Paolo fuori le Mura, S. Gregorio, the Baths of Caracalla, S. Stefano Rotondo, and the Lateran are to be visited. A tour is suggested for the second day which makes still greater demands on the traveller with a thirst for knowledge : from the Mausoleum of Augustus to S. Maria del Popolo, the Trinità de' Monti, Monte Cavallo with the celebrated vignas of Cardinals Carpi and Este, then S. Agnese outside the walls, the Baths of Diocletian, S. Pudenziana, S. Maria Maggiore, the Sette Sale, the Colosseum, the Palatine, the Forum, the Capitol, the Theatre of Marcellus, the Portico of Octavia, and finally the Capodiferro and Farnese palaces. The tour on the

¹ ALDROVANDI, 291.

² Cf. BURCKHARDT, *Beiträge*, 557 *seq.*

³ *Le cose meravigliose dell' alma città di Roma, Roma, 1563* (a copy of this now very rare treatise in the Bibl. Vittorio Emanuele, Rome). CICOGNARA mentions a Venetian edition of 1544, Catalogo, etc., II., Pisa 1821, 184.

third day was to begin at the Piazza Colonna ; besides a visit to the Column of Trajan, the church of the Minerva and the Pantheon, the guide-book recommended a visit to one of the valuable private collections of ancient and modern pictures, namely the house of Mgr. Girolamo Garimberti, Bishop of Gallese, on Monte Citorio. The mid-day meal was to be taken at one of the osterie in the Piazza Navona, near the Pasquino. For the afternoon a visit to the Villa Giulia was recommended.¹

“ In the houses of several Cardinals and many private persons,” continues the same guide, “ there are still many beautiful things to be seen, which I do not name, because they are continually being changed, and I do not wish needlessly to trouble the traveller.” This change was always in the direction of centralization of the ancient works of art. At the beginning of the Cinquecento there were still many small collections, which gradually disappeared. Already in the fourth decade of the century, the larger collections of the Belvedere, the Capitol, the Cesi, Medici and Valle, surpassed the smaller ones in value, whereas formerly, it appears, the really valuable pieces were fairly evenly distributed. At the time of Aldrovandi, the moderate sized collections, containing several really fine works, such as were still to be found in the houses of the Sassi, Maffei and others when Heemskerck was in Rome, had already lost their importance.² Admission to several of these depended upon the influence which the traveller could command.

The numerous and excellently arranged charitable institutions, which were at once a great object of interest and a special feature of Rome, were highly praised by all foreigners.³ The chief centre of Christianity had, from time immemorial, given a living proof of the fructifying energy of the Catholic faith in her works of charity. As had been the case in the Middle Ages, so now the Popes, Cardinals, prelates and laity

¹ *Le cose meravigliose*, 48 seqq. For Garimberti, see HÜBNER I., 100.

² See HÜBNER, I., 74.

³ See above all FABRICIUS, Roma, 215 seq., 232, 261.

of all conditions in the time of the Renaissance were filled with a noble zeal to minister to the needs of the sick, the miserable and the poor. From the point of view of age and comprehensiveness, the hospital of Santo Spirito, which had been re-organized by Sixtus IV., took the first place among the charitable institutions. The hospital of S. Salvatore near the Lateran, and that of S. Giacomo in Augusta, which had been endowed by the Cardinals of the House of Colonna, also enjoyed a great reputation. These, as well as the hospitals attached to S. Maria della Consolazione, S. Antonio and S. Rocco, which the Popes encouraged in every way, by pecuniary support and privileges, were distributed throughout the city in such a way that the needs of the different quarters were well provided for.¹

The national hospices represented a special form of benevolent institution which had been founded by the very numerous foreigners resident in Rome, for the benefit of their fellow-countrymen. In these the Catholic character of Rome as the centre of the Universal Church, found a very characteristic expression. The Germans boasted of the largest number of such institutions in comparison to their number, the first place among these having been taken, since the XIVth century, by the Anima and Campo Santo. To these were added smaller houses for the Flemish and Walloons, the Bohemians and Hungarians. The Spanish, next to the Germans the nation most largely represented in Rome, had, close to S. Giacomo in the Piazza Navona, and S. Maria in Monserrato, houses for the lodging and nursing of their poor and sick pilgrims. In a like manner, the Portuguese, French, English, Scotch, Irish, Poles, Hungarians, Swedes, Dalmatians, and South Slavs, as well as the Lombards, Genoese, Florentines, Sienese and Bergamaschi had their own churches and national hospices,

¹ See Vol. V. of this work, p. 63, and the special literature mentioned there. The celebrated surgeon Gisbert Horst from Amsterdam practised in the hospital of S. Maria della Consolazione (1543-1564); see PERICOLI, S. Maria della Consolazione, Imola, 1879, 98.

and, in most cases, confraternities in connection with them.¹

Several of these institutions were destroyed by the falling away from the faith of so many peoples, but, in spite of this, the Eternal City preserved, even at that critical time, her old pre-eminence in generous hearted love of her neighbour. In closest union with the silently increasing movement in the direction of Catholic Reformation, Christian charity produced in Rome, as in other cities of Italy, the most glorious fruits. After the members of the Oratory of Divine Love had endowed a department of their own for incurables in the old hospital of S. Giacomo in Augusta, Cardinal Giulio de' Medici, who became Pope Clement VII., founded, in the year 1519, the Confraternità della Carità for the assistance of the poor who were ashamed to ask for charity, for the consolation of prisoners and for the burial of the indigent. It was also Cardinal de' Medici who prevailed on Leo X. to sanction the convent for Magdalens in the Corso, which had been founded by the members of the Oratory of Divine Love. The orphanage near S. Maria in Aquiro owed its origin to another Roman prelate.

A great number of institutes arose under Paul III. and were protected by him, by means of which the ingenious charity of benevolent and holy men sought to combat the material and moral evils of the time. The Minorite, Giovanni da Calvi, the merchant Crivelli, and Cardinal Quiñones laid the foundations of the Monte di Pietà at this time. A self-sacrificing son of Spain, Ferrante Ruiz, in conjunction with two nobles of Navarre, founded an establishment for the insane,

¹ Cf. Vol. I. of this work, pp. 248-255, and for the Anima the splendid monograph of SCHMIDLIN (Freiburg 1906), which is founded on a thorough research among archives. The hospital of the Poles was near S. Stefano alla Chiavica, that of the Sienese near S. Caterina da Siena in the Via Giulia (see *Le cose meravigliose*, 25-26). The Bergamaschi received the church of S. Maria della Pietà (see SIMONETTI, *Vie*, 32; *ibid.*, 49 for the church and hospital of the Genoese). Concerning the great number of foreigners in Rome, see RODOCANACHI, *Rome*, 243 *seqq.*; *ibid.* (p. 225 *seq.*) regarding the disappearance of the old higher nobility and the preponderance of the "mezzo ceto" in Rome.

the care of whom had been up till now, almost neglected. A house of refuge for converted female sinners near S. Marta, the hospice for poor girls in peril, near S. Caterina de' Funari, the institute for converts near S. Giovanni del Mercatello at the foot of the Capitol, and a society to assist the poor who were ashamed to beg, all these owed their origin to the zeal of another Spaniard, Ignatius of Loyola. Philip Neri founded in the time of Julius III. the Compagnia della Trinità for the assistance of needy pilgrims, which had Christ alone as its protector. There were also various other institutions for poor girls.

In yet another manner did the impetus in Catholic life make itself felt in the field of charity. The charitable institutions were better directed, and more care was devoted to the spiritual needs of the sick and incurable. In this also it was the example given by Ignatius, and later by Philip Neri, which was so helpful in recalling to the minds of the clergy and laity the words of Our Lord : " As long as you did it to one of these my least brethren, you did it to me."¹

¹ See TACCHI VENTURI, I., 355 *seqq.*, 365, 381 *seq.* ; *cf.* also Vol. X. of this work, p. 476 *seq.* The services of F. Ruiz were commemorated in 1573 in the Chapel of the Madonna della Pietà in the Piazza Colonna by the following inscription : D.O.M. Ferdinando Ruitio Hispalensi praesbytero integerrimo quod religionis ergo hospitalem hanc domum pauperibus exteris ac mente captis primus erigendam curaverit, quod eandem annuo censu de suo dotaverit, quod ibidem pietatis studio diem suum obire voluerit sodales et curatores domus viro optime merito pos. pro eius eterna salute quotidianas Deo preces sacrumq. anniversarium ad XIII. Kal. April. supremo eius die instituere M.D. LXXIII. When Benedict XIII. removed the lunatic asylum in 1728 to the Lungara, this inscription was placed in the entrance hall of the chapel of S. Maria della Pietà there (see FORCELLA, XII., 387 *seqq.*) ; at the demolition of the asylum in 1911 it disappeared. In the church of S. Caterina de' Funari, which is very difficult of access, the chapel endowed by F. Ruiz, and richly adorned with coloured marbles and paintings is, however, still in existence ; it is the first on the left hand side. See NIBBY, Roma nel 1838, Parte prima moderna, Roma, 1839, 149.

As in all other things, so in the field of charity preparations were being made for the glorious epoch of Catholic reformation and restoration, in which gentle saints and mighty Popes were indefatigably engaged in the relief of the spiritual and corporal needs of their fellow men. While this remarkable epoch brought about a complete change in spiritual life, so did the “ Roma Aeterna,” which had received a very worldly impress in the days of the Renaissance, undergo a similar metamorphosis, and that not in her outward appearance alone. With her great and glorious churches, charitable institutions, great monasteries, and seminaries for priests of all the different nations, she again became, through the increase of the religious sense among her inhabitants, that for which Providence had designed her, as the seat of the successors of St. Peter, the Holy City, which embodied, in the most glorious manner, the Christian ideal.

APPENDIX
OF
UNPUBLISHED DOCUMENTS
AND
EXTRACTS FROM ARCHIVES.

APPENDIX.

PRELIMINARY NOTICE.

THE documents brought together here are only intended to serve as a confirmation and completion of my book, as it is not my purpose to make a special collection of original records. The source of each is given as exactly as possible but explanatory remarks are, for reasons of space, as brief as possible. As far as the text itself is concerned, I have, as a rule, retained the original script, changes made with respect to capitals and punctuation require no explanation. Where emendation has been attempted, it need only be mentioned that trifling errors and obvious slips of the pen have been put right without special remark. Additions are indicated by square brackets, doubtful or obscure passages are followed by a note of interrogation or "sic." Such passages as I did not consider essential or useful for my purpose have been omitted; these are indicated by dots (. . . .).

Professor Dr. Pogatscher and the Rev. Dr. Bruder have rendered me such valuable assistance in the correction of these documents as well as in other parts of these volumes, and Prof. Dr. J. Schmidlin such aid in the collection of the matter, that I must take this opportunity of again tendering my most grateful thanks to these scholars.

I. ENDIMIO CALANDRA TO HIS BROTHER SABINO.¹

1550, Februar 8, Roma.

. . . S' ha posto S. Stà il nome di Giulio et mostra di volere essere magnanimo, grato et cortese, ma come s' è fatto insperatamente et appunto, come vi scrissi, che subito che è stato

¹ See *supra*, p. 43.

proposto da Francesi Farnese vi è callato come in creatura sua non havendo riguardo a promesse fatte ne a fede data, non s'è visto ancora molta allegria nelli animi delle persone, se non che sia fatto il Papa che qui a starene senza tanto tempo pareva cosa molto strana, et per quello che se ne spera per li saggi che ha dati di se qui et in altro luogo quando ha governato, si tien per certo chel suo habbia ad essere un buon papato . . .

[Orig. Gonzaga Archives, Mantua.]

2. PIRRO OLIVO TO SABINO CALANDRA.¹

1550, Februar 12, Roma.

. . . . Pensi V. S. che dopo tante gratie fatte el belle parole S. Stà disse che si riputava gran gratia chel cardinale nostro le addimandasse qualche gran cosa. In somma è troppo, et il cardinale con tutta la corte ne sta con allegrezza infinita. Tutta la città poi ne mostra contento infinito, perche gia l' ha sgravata di molte gravezze impostele da Papa Paulo. Ha ordinato che le spoglie che per morte di cardinali andavano alla sede apostolica siano de qui innanzi degli heredi o s' habbino a dividere fra i servitori di quel cardinale, secondo la mente sua. Dona ad ogniuno et ad ogniuno fa gratia, onde voglio che speriamo di lui quel bene et servizio di Dio che ci promette così generoso animo. Egli è persona allegra, popolare, ha già dato ordine a certi commissarij deputati sopra delle vettovaglie che faccino che la città sia abundevole et che le cose si paghino a mercato conveniente . . .

[Orig. Gonzaga Archives, Mantua.]

3. PIRRO OLIVO TO SABINO CALANDRA.²

1550, Februar 15, Roma

. . . Giovedì volse che si desse principio alle maschere et domani ha ordinato che si corrano i palii. Egli è poi allegro et burla volentieri colli suoi, come fece l' altra sera che mangiando del cardo disse al suo copier : Habbiam noi bevuto da che mangiamo il cardo ? Al quale rispose il copiere, che non voleva che S. Stà disordinasse : Padre santo, sì, et egli trovandosi in piedi colle mani alle cintura rispose : Padre santo, no.

[Orig. Gonzaga Archives, Mantua.]

¹ See *supra*, p. 52. For P. Olivo cf. SICKEL, *Römische Berichte*, in the *Sitzungsberichten der Wiener Akademie* CXXXIII., 114.

² See *supra*, p. 53.

4. BENEDETTO BUONANNI TO COSIMO I., DUKE OF TUSCANY.¹

1550, Februar 23, Roma.

. . . Il sig. Baldovino anderà presto a starsene in palazzo in Torre Borgia et per quanto s'intende non ha animo S. Bue di fare cardinal lui, ma quel prepostino,² suo allievo, per il quale si manderà in breve. All' ambasciator mio³ disse S. Stà che disegnava di dargli il suo cappello et qui si vedrà quel che sa fare la fortuna quando ella toglie a sollevare un homo. Credo che simil resolutione oscurerà assai molte buone opere di S. Stà nella qual credo che habbino a vedersi molte volte alcune cose da basso animo, come fu quella notte di carnovale quando volse che a tavola sua mangiaseno il s^{or} Baldovino, l' arcivescovo Sipontino,⁴ il vescovo di Vasona⁵ et il suo medico da Barga;⁶ la qual cosa fu molto considerata et dette assai che dire . . .

[Orig. State Archives, Florence.]

5. POPE JULIUS III. TO CARDINAL MARCELLO CERVINI.⁷

1550, Februar 24, Roma.

Dilecto filio nostro Marcello tituli sanctae Crucis in Hierusalem presbitero cardinali. [Di]lecte fili noster, salutem. Accepimus quod alias felicitis recordationis Paulus papa III immediatus predecessor noster, defuncto bonae memoriae Augustino episcopo Chisamensi⁸ bibliothecario bibliothecae nostrae palatinae, ne dicta bibliotheca detrimentum pateretur, de tua multiplici doctrina ac singulari erga rem litterariam studio et amore confisus, eiusdem bibliothecae protectionem et curam circumspectioni tuae forsán vivae vocis oraculo demandavit, ita quod eiusdem bibliothecae custodes ac in ea scriptores et operarios quoslibet ad libitum tuum confirmare aut amovere et toties quoties opus foret alios deputare et de [sa]lario bibliothecario pro tempore debito quomodolibet disponere aliaque facere et exequi posses, quae ad ipsius bibliothecae conservationem et augmentum pertinere iudicares. Ut autem hoc honestum et laudabile negocium, quod nobis valde cordi est, eo libentius et animosius peragere valeas,

¹ See *supra*, pp. 49, 70, 71.² A. Serristori.³ See *supra*, p. 142, n. 3, Concerning the physicians.⁶ See *supra*, p. 327.⁴ Innocenzo del Monte.⁵ S. Pighini.⁸ Ag. Steuco.⁵ T. Cortese.

quo nostra quoque fueris in hoc auctoritate munitus, commissionis dicti Pauli predecessoris vigore per te hactenus gesta confirmantes ac rata habentes, protectionem et curam huiusmodi tibi quoad vixeris ita, quod omnia et singula supradicta libere agere et exequi possis, auctoritate apostolica tenore presentium demandamus, mandantes custodibus, scriptoribus ac operariis predictis ut tibi non secus ac nobis obediant et ad quos spectat ut de dicto salario ad libitum tuum disponant, contrariis non obstantibus quibuscunque.

Datum Romae 24 februarii 1550 anno primo.

Blosius.

[Min. brev. Arm. 41, t. 55, n. 62. Secret Archives of the Vatican.]

6. AVERARDO SERRISTORI TO COSIMO I., DUKE OF TUSCANY.¹

1550, Februar 26, Roma.

. . . E disse ai Conservatori di Roma che voleva attendere S. B^{no} per il beneficio di questa città alle cose della iustitia et della abundantia. Circa quel che toccava alla iustitia disse, che pensava et d' intenderla et di sapere farla eseguire senza ch' alcuno potesse sperare d' haverle a dare a intendere una cosa per un' altra et che sperava in Dio che detta iustitia sarebbe sì bene et sì indifferentemente usata in questa corte, che i buoni havessero a starne interamente contenti. Circa la abundantia disse, che haveva bisogno d' aiuto et in questo caso commesse a' detti Conservatori che vedessero che i frumenti et biade non fossero tenute nascoste per le fosse et granai da chi n' haveva in quantità per aspettare di venderle care, ma che al prezzo honesto si mettessero per le piazze solite, perchè a questo modo si provvederebbe per adesso a un honesto vivere, et se no 'l facevono giuro loro, che non solamente tornerebbe la gravezza della macina, ma ne metterebbe loro dell' altre.

[Orig. State Archives, Florence.]

7. CONSISTORY OF MARCH 10TH, 1550.²

. . . [Iulius III] habuit orationem, qua egit gratias rev. d. cardinalibus de assumptione sua ad summum pontificatum

¹ See *supra*, p. 54.

² See *supra*, pp. 57, 158.

suumque prosequendi concilii desiderium ostendit mandavitque rev. d. decano, Tusculano, Crescentio, Sfondrato, Cibo et Polo, ut de curiae Romanae reformatione in curia presertim datariatus curam susciperent.

[Acta consist. Camer. VIII. Consistorial Archives of the Vatican.]

8. AVERARDO SERRISTORI TO COSIMO I., DUKE OF TUSCANY.¹

1550, March 10, Roma.

. . . Entro di poi S. Stà a dire che havendo pensato più volte, d' onde potesse nascere ch' el clero fusse così odioso nel conspetto dei principi temporali, s' era resoluta a credere che procedesse solo dalla avaritia, che nei capi s' era mostra [ta] in questa corte, dalle non buone provisioni che si facevano nel conferire i beneficii, et dal troppo luxu di detto clero nel vestirsi, et che havendo animo di rimediarvi s' era resoluta circa la cosa dell' avaritia di far reformare il datariato et a tale effetto elesse i r^{mi} Trani, Theatino, Sfondrato, Crescentio, Inghilterra et Cibo perchè riducessero le cose di detto offitio a quel che loro S. B^{ne} giudicavano convenire et che S. Stà farebbe osservare inviolabilmente quel che da loro fusse risoluto et stabilito. Circa le provisioni dei beneficii che vacassero, disse che non tenessero S. Stà di natura così facile ch' ella havebbe havuta a indursi ai preghi di quel r^{mi} che gle li havevano domandati dai indulti sopra questa chiesa et quella et ch' ella vi s' era mossa per un fine solo, ch' era d' alleggerirsi di tanto peso per havere più compagni in dette provisioni a fin che si potesse più oportunamente provvedere ai beneficii che vacassero di persone che fussero apte a tenere le chiese et reggerle. Circa il luxu disse che presto reformerebbe la casa sua et che dal suo esemplo confortava ciascuno a seguirla in se nei suoi creati e servitori. Satisfecce sommamente S. Stà in tutto quel ch' ella disse et ogni di va avanzando l' aspettatione che s' havena delle buone opere sue . . .

[Orig. State Archives, Florence.]

9. BENEDETTO BUONANNI TO COSIMO I., DUKE OF TUSCANY.²

1550, August 2, Roma.

. . . S. Stà disse hier mattina che col collegio de' cardinali bisognava far come con un monasterio che non si potesse

¹ See *supra*, pp. 57, 158.

² See *supra*, p. 159.

reformare per diligentia che vi s' usasse et che all' ultimo fusse forzato il vescovo di luogo a commetter che non si potesse metter alcuna monaca in detto monasterio per lassar consumar et morir quelle che v' erano et che cosi poteva farsi con decto collegio per lassare spegnere il superfluo che v' era . . .

[Orig. State Archives, Florence.]

IO. JUDGMENT OF CARDINAL MARCELLO CERVINI AS INQUISITOR.¹

1551, Januar 29, Roma.

Nos Marcellus divina providentia cardinalis s^{tao} romanae ecclesiae tituli s^{ta} Crucis, unus ex inquisitoribus generalibus universi orbis a s^{ta} Sede Apostolica delegatis gratiam et salutem in Christo Ihesu Deo ac Domino nostro. Cum summi Dei legumque omnium iustitiae sanctiores peccatores vel nequissimos sincere et ex intimo corde humiliatos mira clementia complectantur et pro gemitibus et lacrimis culpas enormes condonent et, permutatis poenis gravioribus in leviores, eosdem uti filios emendent, Nos ab hac lege non discedentes, perspecta quantum nobis constat in exteriori homine humilitate ac resipiscentia Annibalis Montarentii Bononiensis iuris utriusque doctoris ab haeresibus, quibus fuerat implicitus, cognita insuper obedientia ad subeundas poenas illi decretas ex iure in sententia contra eundem lata per nos et coniudices nostros ill^{mos} et rev^{mos} inquisitores generales, autoritate nostra et eorundem ill^{rum} et rev^{rum} dominorum inquisitorum etc., iudicavimus preces humillimas dicti Annibalis exaudiendas et misericorditer sublevandas ac permutandas in parte poenas eidem ut supra impositas, sperantes te Annibalem hic praesentem hac clementia magis ac magis Deo, ecclesiae et ministris eiusdem fore devinciendum, in detestationem malignantium haereticorum et in salutem animae tuae.

Imprimis igitur bona tua, a quibus ex iure excideras, paterno animo tibi condonamus ex gratia, volentes ea omnia in tua esse facultate, ac si nunquam ab eis ob haereses decidisses, concedentes et volentes insuper quod possis assequi et adire quascunque haereditates quovis iure obvenientes; et pro huiusmodi gratia condemnamus te ad numerandum et solvendum libras quinquaginta bolonenorum monetae Bononiensis

¹ See *supra*, p. 217.

rektoribus societatis pauperum verecundorum Bononiensium, et tenearis hoc fecisse infra terminum praesentis anni, et cum persolveris tantum pecuniæ, debeas habere a rektoribus praedictis attestationem in scriptis, quam consignes domino inquisitori Bononiensi pro tempore etc.

Item sententias per te quomodocunque latas vel instrumenta per te facta, cum ultra annum implicitus esses haeresibus, firma et rata volumus, facimus et decernimus.

Item abolemus infamiam, quam incurristi ex decretis canonicis ob graves haereses, quibus per aliquot annos adhaeseras, restituentes tibi insuper ex misericordia gradum doctoratus et facultatem ad officia publica consequenda, non autem ad beneficia ecclesiastica.

Volentes tamen, ne videamur dissimulare tam grave scelus haeresis, quod loco istarum poenarum tenearis toto tempore vitae tuae ieiunare singulis feriis sextis dieque eadem dicere septem psalmos poenitentiales et largiri elemosinam pauperi ut tibi suggesserit Spiritus Sanctus. Itidem volumus et imponimus quod serves feria quarta de ieiunio, psalmis et elemosina per annum continuum.

Item quod tenearis perpetuis temporibus ter in anno confiteri peccata tua sacerdoti et devotius sumere sanctissimum Eucharistiae sacramentum.

Item loco perpetui carceris, in quo eras immurandus, ex clementia tibi decernimus civitatem Genuae, quam nequeas egredi nisi de licentia inquisitoris Genuensis; cum vero e Genua discesseris, civitas Bononiensis erit tibi carcer perpetuus; quem non exhibis nisi ex licentia inquisitoris Bononiensis.

Item volumus et imponimus tibi quod ter in mense te praesentes inquisitori Genuensi vel Bononiensi, si Bononiae fueris, ut cognoscat an in veritate ambules etc. Volentes quod tenearis ad huiusmodi commutationes et impositiones poenitentiae sub poenis et censuris in tua abiuratione positis etc.; reservantes insuper officio nostro auctoritatem remittendi, reducendi, commutandi, mitigandi poenas ut supra per nos commutatas et impositas omni meliori modo etc.

[Cod. Vat. 6429, 38—39, Vatican Library.]

II. AVERARDO SERRISTORI TO COSIMO I., DUKE OF TUSCANY.¹

1551, Januar. 31, Rom.

. . . Le stanze erano parate di panni bellissimi et finissimi et a capo della tavola fu messo un candelliere d'argento sopra una banchetta piccola ch'era in terra, sì vago et fatto con sì mirabile arte, che ciascuno haveva che dirne. Dicono che l'ha fatto uno da Venetia che lavora in Pesaro, et che della manifattura sola domanda mille scudi. La torcia che stava sopra detto candelliere, alto a mio credere circa 3 braccia, usciva d'una canna d'argento finta a modo di torcia, ma non mostrava detta torcia altro di sè che il lume, et per via d'un contrapeso s'andava sempre tanto alzando in quella canna d'argento la torcia quanto ella s'andava consumando. Data che fu l'acqua alle mani fu messo al piè della tavola un pesce d'argento, che per via di contrapesi andò caminando sino al capo d'essa movendo capo et coda nel medesimo modo che quando un pesce vero è nell' acqua. Come fu giunto in testa di detta tavola, dette uno sguizzo in aere, et aprendosi sopra la schena cominciò a tornare indietro, et in luogo delle lisce erano stecchi, dei quali ciascuno andò pigliando secondo che arrivava inanzi a altrui. Sopra le porte principali della casa ch'erono due, furono messe due tele grandi con l'arme del Chr^{mo} et con una inscriptione a piè, che diceva Henricco II Francorum Regi ob Bononiam receptam ac Galliae et Scotiae Regnum terra marique feliciter pacatum. Si fecero inanzi al banchetto grandissimi fuochi, et doppo, diverse sorti di musiche divinissime. . . .

[Orig. State Archives, Florence.]

12. IPPOLITO CAPILUPI TO THE DUCHESS OF MANTUA.²

1551, Februar 3, Rom.

At the Pranzo in the Belvedere "S. Stà andò con tutta la compagnia de' cardinali che erano 24 alla commedia, dove sono stato anch'io : il luogo dove stanno li spettatori non è capace più di dugento persone, nè ve ne capiscono ancho tante, perchè la persona di S. Stà et de r^{mi} occupano la maggior parte, la scena e piccola similmente a proportionione del luogo, ma bella e

¹ See *supra*, p. 63.² See *supra*, p. 65.

vaga da vedere : la commedia è stata l'Aulularia di Plauto latino, ben vestita et recitata da fanciulli con intermezzi di buone musiche et di certi Norcini che hanno fatto ridere assai, et è sodisfatta generalmente a tutti."

[Orig. Gonzaga Archives, Mantua.]

13. IPPOLITO CAPILUPI TO THE DUCHESS OF MANTUA.¹

1551, Februar 14, Rom.

Festival of the Carnival. La domenica passata, che fu il dì della creatione di S. St^a essa secondo il costume invitò tutti i rev^{mi} a disenare con seco et dopo pranzo li condusse insieme con gli ambasciatori di Francia, Portogallo et Vinezia et altri in Belvedere a veder recitare una commedia composta da m. Alessandro Martio Senese et servitor del rev^{mo} S. Giorgio, la quale per quel che ognuno riferisce riuscì molto inepta et poco honesta et nelli atti et nelle parole, et poco manco che non fusse sibilata con tutto che vi fosse la presentia di S. St^a et li spectatori fussero pochi per la incapacità del luogo et persone honorate, et S. St^a fastidita dall' ineptie di detta commedia si adormentò et dormì buona pezza et alla fine della commedia disse che [chi] l' havea composta meritava iscusatione perchè era Senese. . . . Here follows a report concerning further festivities, bull-fights on St. Peter's Square, etc.

[Orig. Gonzaga Archives, Mantua.]

14. POPE JULIUS III. TO PAULUS JOVIUS.²

1551, August 15, Rom.

Julius pp. III.

Venerabilis frater, salutem etc. Librum, quo illustrium virorum³ imagines⁴ pro ingenio et eloquentia tua⁵ varie et copiose ornasti, a te nobis nuper missum, valde libenter accepimus ; nec minus libenter cognoscendis illorum moribus et actis, praesertim tam erudite a te explicatis, aliquid nonnunquam succesivi temporis non mediocri cum voluptate im-

¹ See *supra*, p. 65.

² See *supra*, p. 329.

³ Corrected from ducum.

⁴ Cf. FUETER, 51 f 55.

⁵ Corrected from ingenio eloquentiae tuae elegantia.

pertiemus. Interea (vero)¹ maioris historiae tuae partem alteram, quam te nobis scripsisti ita iam comparatam habere ut in lucem (hominum)¹ prodire possit, cum aliquo etiam desiderio nostro expectabimus. (Speramus scilicet per labores et vigilias tuas res gestas aetatis nostrae ad posteritatis memoriam quam diutissime propagatum iri, et ad celebritatem eius nominis, quod iampridem in multiplici literarum laude consecutus es, praeclarum cumulum accessurum.)¹ Quod vero, si per pedum aegritudinem tibi licitum fuerit, te ad nos accessurum polliceris, id si divino adiuvante numine evenerit, nos quidem te, quem doctrinae et urbanitatis² causa semper plurimum dileximus, libentissime videbimus, atque omni, quam res et tempus feret, benevoli ac propensi animi significatione prosequemur.

Datum etc. Romae apud sanctum Petrum etc. die XV augusti 1551, anno 2°.

Rom[ulus Amasaeus].

[Min. brev. Arm. 41, t. 61, n. 693. Secret Archives of the Vatican.]

15. POPE JULIUS III. TO FRANCISCUS DE AUGUSTINIS.³

1552, Mai 6, Rom.

“Cupientes pro publico commodo almae Urbis nostrae, et pro nostrorum subditorum utilitate antiquam Tyberis navigationem a Portu S. Ioannis territorii Perusini usque ad confinia nostrae civitatis Hortorum inclusive ab aliquibus ex nostris predecessoribus olim tentatum, instaurare, et antequam id fiat, scire quibus modis, viis ac rationibus et quanta etiam impensa fieri possit.” We appoint you a commissary for this purpose and command you to proceed with “Petroleone Percello comite Vallis Codalis” to examine channel and shore, to announce to us “conficiendi rationem” and to inform the inhabitants within 15 miles that it is our intention . . . “ut quemadmodum utilitatem non parvam ex ipsa navigatione percepturi sint, ita aliquam impensarum ratam in eam contribuant, quae postea in opere conficiendo eis significabitur.” We command that people shall lodge and assist you.

[Min. brev. Arm. 41, t. 64, n. 297. Secret Archives of the Vatican.]

¹ The words in brackets are erased in the original.

² Originally ingenii et doctrinae.

³ See *supra*, p. 157.

16. POPE JULIUS III. TO CARDINAL JUAN ALVAREZ DE TOLEDO.¹

1552, Juli 29, Rom.

Dilecto filio nostro Ioanni tituli s^{ti} Pancratii presbitero
cardinali Compostellano nuncupato.

Iulius papa III.

Dilecte fili noster, salutem, etc. Cum sicut accepimus dilecti filii prepositus et clerici regulares congregationis Sancti Pauli Mediolanensis, per fe. re. Clementem VII primo institute et deinde Paulum III romanos pontifices predecessores nostros ac postremo nos et sedem apostolicam variis privilegiis locupletate, quosdam libros per quondam Baptistam de Crema dum viveret ordinis fratrum predicatorum professorem, ab eodem ordine per sedem apostolicam exemptum, cuius cadaver in monasterio monialium s^{ti} Pauli conversi etiam Mediolanensis ordinis s^{ti} Augustini perinde ac sanctificatum (facili tamen prepositi et clericorum predictorum necnon dilectarum in Christo filiarum priorisse et conventus dicti monasterii credulitate) custoditur, editos, quos nuper venerabiles fratres nostri sancte romane ecclesie cardinales ad officium inquisitionis heretice pravitatis apostolica auctoritate deputati, de quorum numero tu existis, per diversos religiosos sacre theologie professores diligenter examinari fecerunt et etiam ipsi examinarunt, et deinde eosdem tamquam doctrinam scandalosam in plurimis, in aliis vero temerariam et in multis hereticam continentes, de ipsorum professorum consilio et assensu damnarunt et reprobarunt, per multos annos passim et indistincte legerint et forsitan de presenti legant; et insuper post delegatam a sede apostolica curam visitandi monasterium predictum preposito pro tempore existenti dicte congregationis, is et predicti clerici aditum apud conventum predictum crebrius quam decuit sibi sensim usurpantes capitulumque et alia acta publica una cum dictis priorissa et conventu facientes etiam regimini et administrationi ceterisque negotiis publicis dicti monasterii hactenus simul incubuerint librosque predictos eisdem priorisse et monialibus legendos, et ulterius dilectam in Christo filiam Paulam Antoniam monialem dicti monasterii elogium homini inconcessum scilicet matris divine sibi ipsi temere arrogari ceterisque quibusdam apud superstitionibus

¹ See *supra*, p. 213.

et signanter quoad mutuum defectuum uniuscuiusque eorundem incusationem palam inter eos faciendam diutius abuti permiserint et ex facili continuaque eorundem cum dictis priorissa et monialibus conversatione scandalum non modicum in vulgus generarint: quapropter, nisi vetitis utrobique et doctrine usu et communicatione aliisque abusibus predictis, de quibus cardinales deputati predicti vel ab eis sub-deputati ex duorum clericorum dicte congregationis relatione informationem ampliorem habuerunt, prepositus et clerici at priorissa et moniales predicti ad veram regularis discipline normam per salubris reformationis antidotum reducantur, ipseque priorissa et moniales iuxta sue regule institutionem debita clausura arceantur, valde profecto timendum sit, ne cetera cum virorum tum mulierum partium illarum monasteria et alia regularia loca in similes errores prorumpant: Nos igitur, quibus pro cura nostra pastoralis incumbit indirecta dirigere at salubria plantare, ne doctrina predicta una cum dictis abusibus longius latiusque serpens gregem dominicum inficiat, ea ab eisdem congregatione et monasterio imprimis evellere scandalisque predictis quantum possumus obviare, et, ut dicta congregatio opportunis adiuta presidiis uberiores in agro domini fructus producere queat, eidem de utili et idoneo protectore providere volentes, motu proprio, non ad tuam vel alterius pro te nobis super hoc oblate petitionis instantiam, sed de nostra mera deliberatione, circumspectionem tuam, cuius eximia fides, ingenii claritas, gravitas ac in infrascriptas exequendis singularis atque matura experientia alique permulte virtutes veteris experientie documento nobis haud ignote sunt sub cuiusque presidio dictam congregationem salubre incrementum suscepturam non dubitamus, protectorem ipsius congregationis in Romana curia ac apud nos et dictam sedem cum auctoritate potestate et facultate aliis protectoribus ordinum quorumcunque attributis dicta auctoritate tenore presentium constituimus et deputamus, precipientes in virtute sancte obedientie preposito et congregationi predictis ac quibusvis aliis, ad quos pertinet, ut te in eorum et dicte congregationis protectorem recipiant et admittant ac obsequia aliis eiusmodi protectoribus impendi solita exhibeant; et insuper eidem circumspectioni tue per presentes committimus et mandamus, ut per te vel alium seu alios seculares vel cuiusvis ordinis etiam mendicantium regulares, quem seu quos ad hoc duxeris

eligendum seu eligendos, ad domos et loca congregationis ac monasterium et conventum huiusmodi accedens, eadem ac prepositum et clericos necnon priorissam et moniales aliasque utriusque sexus personas illorum auctoritate nostra visitare doctrinamque predictam eiusque usum et lecturam tam publicam quam privatam necnon singulos predictos ceterosque abusus imprimis et ante omnia prohibere ac omnia et singula alia, que correctione, emendatione et punitioe indigere cognoveris seu ipsi deputandi cognoverint, in spiritualibus et temporalibus tam in capite quam in membris reformare et emendare eadem auctoritate procures. Nos enim tibi et a te deputando seu deputandis predictis tam circa premissa quam alias de statu congregationis ac monasterii et conventus necnon vita ac moribus tam prepositi et clericorum quam priorisse et monialium predictorum studiose inquirendi et eos ex preposito et clericis ac priorissa et monialibus, qui delinquentes et alias culpabiles comperti fuerint, iuxta regularia sui instituta atque delicti exigentiam ac canonicarum sanctionum dispositionem etiam per incarcerationem, penis debitis absque iudiciorum strepitu puniendi, castigandi et corrigendi, ac prepositum et priorissam necnon clericos et moniales predictos ab eorum administrationibus et officiis, si eorum demerita id exegerint, perpetuo vel ad tempus suspendendi et privandi, ac ab illis realiter et cum effectu amovendi eorundemque loco de eis aliis personis providendi aut per petuo vel ad tempus substituendi; necnon delinquentes quoslibet, si id humiliter petierint, ab excessibus et delictis etiam heresis necnon excommunicationis, suspensionis et interdicti aliisque sententiis, censuris et penis ecclesiasticis et temporalibus quibuslibet in foro conscientie tantum, iniuncta eis pro modo culpe penitentia salutari, absolvendi; ac pro salubri regimine et directione dicti monasterii tam dictam Paulam Antoniam quam alias personas tibi benevisas de dicto monasterio ad aliud monasterium seu regularem locum tibi benevisum, ut inibi quamdiu tibi videbitur permaneant, mutandi, ac omnia et singula alia que pro salubri directione et reformatione predictis ac alias iuxta canonicas sanctiones ac congregationis et ordinis predictorum regularia instituta eorundemque regimen et administrationem necessaria fuerint et quomodolibet opportuna faciendi, ordinandi statuendi et mandandi, ac contradictores quoslibet et rebelles, cuiuscunque dignitatis, status,

gradus, ordinis vel conditionis fuerint, per excommunicationis, suspensionis et interdicti aliasque formidabiliores, de quibus expendi fore videbitur, sententias, censuras et penas, appellatione postposita, compescendi ac legitimis super his habendis servatis processibus sententias censuras et penas ipsas etiam iteratis vicibus aggravandi auxiliumque brachii secularis, si opus fuerit, invocandi plenam et liberam auctoritate predicta tenore presentium concedimus facultatem; non obstantibus premissis et apostolicis ac in provincialibus et sinodalibus conciliis editis generalibus vel specialibus constitutionibus et ordinationibus necnon congregationis ac monasterii et conventus ordinisque predictorum iuramento, confirmatione apostolica vel quavis firmitate alia roboratis statutis et consequentudinibus, privilegiis quoque, indultis, exemptionibus, conservatoriis et litteris apostolicis eisdem preposito et clericis ac prioris et conventui earumque monasterio, domibus ordinibus superioribus et personis sub quibuscunque tenoribus et formis ac cum quibusvis clausulis et decretis per predictos et quoscunque alios romanos pontifices etiam predecessores nostros ac nos et sedem predictam etiam motu simili ac consistorialiter et alias in contrarium quomodolibet concessis, confirmatis et innovatis; quibus omnibus, etiam si pro illorum sufficienti derogatione de illis eorumque totis tenoribus specialis, specifica, expressa et individua ac de verbo ad verbum, non autem per clausulas generales idem importantes, mentio seu quevis alia expressio habenda aut aliqua alia exquisita forma ad hoc servanda foret, tenores huiusmodi presentibus pro sufficienter expressis et insertis habentes, illis alias in suo robore permansuris, hac vice duntaxat specialiter at expresse derogamus, contrariis quibuscunque, aut si preposito et clericis ac prioris et conventui predictis vel quibusvis aliis communiter vel divisim a dicta sit sede indultum, quod aliquos contra eis concessa privilegia et indulta ad visitandum eosdem admittere minime teneantur et ad id compelli, ipsique ad iudicium trahi aut interdicti, suspendi vel excommunicari non possint per litteras apostolicas non facientes plenam et expressam ac de verbo ad verbum de indulto huiusmodi mentionem, et quibuslibet aliis privilegiis, exemptionibus, conservatoriis, indulgentiis et litteris apostolicis generalibus vel specialibus, quorumcunque tenorum existant, per que presentibus non expressa vel totaliter non inserta visitationis et

aliorum premissorum effectus tueque iurisdictionis explicatio impediri valeat quomodolibet vel differri et de quibus quorumque totis tenoribus de verbo ad verbum habenda sit in nostris litteris mentio specialis et que quoad premissa nolumus eisdem in aliquo suffragari.

Datum Rome apud sanctum Marcum etc. die 29 iulii, 1552, anno 3°.

Protectio huiusmodi cum facultate suprascripta visa fuit necessaria rev^{inis} dominis meis cardinalibus inquisitoribus, et nisi fiat reformatio ut petitur quoad libros et mores, non nomen monasterii sed aliud habere merebitur.

J. Card. Puteus.
Gal.

[Min. brev. Arm. 41, t. 65, n. 523. Secret Archives of the Vatican.]

17.—18. POPE JULIUS III. TO HANNIBAL SPATAFORA.¹

1553, Februar 24, Rom.

Dilecto filio Hanibali Spatafore archimandrite Messanensi ordinis s. Basilii commissario nostro.

Dilecte fili, salutem. Accepimus reperiri in nonnullis regni neapolitani et praesertim provinciae Calabriae et insulae Siciliae monasteriis ordinis s. Basilii, quae in commendam obtinentur et in quibus monachi graeci degunt, diversos libros graecos tum sacros tum profanos, qui hactenus typis excusi non fuerunt, raros sane nec parvi momenti aut aestimationis, ex quibus, si vel eorum fierent exemplaria vel imprimerentur, magna ab omnibus capi utilitas et commoditas posset providereturque ne aut a tineis corroderentur aut absumerentur a tempore, sicut plurimis aliis accidit. Quare nos, qui veterum scriptorum memoriam, et maxime illorum qui pro christiana religione insudarunt, quantum in nobis est, ad Dei servitum et publicam commoditatem et utilitatem conservare desideramus, neque tamen dicta monasteria ipsis libris privare intendimus, confisi in doctrina, prudentia ac diligentia tua, mandamus tibi, ut ad dicta monasteria te personaliter conferas et bibliothecas vel alia loca, in quibus dicti libri conservantur, invisas librosque

¹ See *supra*, p. 327.

ipsos diligenter inquiras et scruteris, et eos qui cognitione et instauratione digni libi videbuntur seponas et presentibus notario publico et testibus a commendatariis ipsorum monasteriorum, si inibi fuerint, alias ab eorum agentibus aut monachis et conventibus monasteriorum eorundem tibi nostro nomine recepturo consignari facias et ad nos vel comportes vel transmittas ; nam, posteaquam vel transcribi vel imprimi eos fecerimus, ipsis monasteriis quorum fuerunt omnino reddentur. Si vero, quod non credimus, dictos libros perquirere non permitteris vel illi quos volueris tibi denegabuntur, tibi quod tam ipsos commendatarios quam eorum agentes aut ipsorum monasteriorum monachos et conventus ad permittendum tibi quod libros ipsos perquirere possis et ad eos quos volueris tibi, ut prefertur, consignandum per censuras ecclesiasticas et alia oportuna iuris remedia, appellatione postposita et invocato si opus fuerit auxilio brachii secularis, cogere et compellere valeas facultatem et potestatem apostolica auctoritate tenore presentium damus et concedimus, non obstantibus constitutionibus et ordinationibus apostolicis ac monasteriorum [eius] ordinis predictorum, etiam iuramento, confirmatione apostolica vel quavis firmitate alia roboratis, statutis et consuetudinibus contrariis quibuscunque ; seu si aliquibus etc. mentionem [etc.].

Datum Rome apud Sanctum Petrum etc. die XXIII februaryi 1553 anno 4.^o

Ita S^{mus} D. N. mandavit.

M. Cardinalis sanctae Crucis
Io[annes].

[Min. brev. Arm. 41, t. 67, n. 120. Secret Archives of the Vatican.]

19. CAMILLO CAPILUPI TO CARDINAL ERCOLE GONZAGA.¹

1553, Mart. 14, Rom.

. . . Due di sono che qui incomincia a far bel tempo et S. Stà se ne va ogni di alla Vigna, alla quale si fabrica molto gagliardamente. S. Stà ha pensato di voler mettere il Borgo in fortezza et similmente S. Pietro col Palagio, et già si sono

¹ See *supra*, p. 354.

cominciate a far le fosse dalla parte della muraglia di Borgo che è congiunta col Palagio et col Castello dov' è il corridore, et si lavora anco dalla parte di S. Pietro, cioè dietro la fabrica là sopra il monte dove è quella muraglia vecchia. . . .

[Orig. Gonzaga Archives, Mantua.]

20. C. TITIO TO COSIMO I., DUKE OF TUSCANY.¹

1553, Mart. 14, Rom.

. . . Ha detto un cardinale a un amico mio, che il rè di Francia et il card. di Lorena hanno scritto qui al ambasciator regio che non faccia più parole ne ricerchi S. Stà per conto della promontione di Ghisa, poichè tante volte ha promesso di farla et menatola in lungo d'hoggi in domani nè mai n'è venuto a conclusione alcuna, et che quando lo facci o non lo facci non gle ne sapranno grado alcuno. Questo cardinale, che dall' ambasciator intese questo in molta confidentia, dice che corse subito a dirlo al Papa, il qual disse con molta colera che per ancora non l'haveva fatto et che avanti lo facessi ne voleva esser arcipregato et poi risolversi a quel che più li piacesse. . . .

[Orig. State Archives, Florence].

21. POPE JULIUS III. TO KING FERDINAND.²

1553, November 20, Rom.

Ferdinando regi Romanorum.

Mittimus ad M^{tem} tuam dil. fil. Zachariam electum Pharen., praelatum nostrum domesticum, qui tuae M^{ti} has litteras reddidit . . . , ut dil. fil. Hieronymo Martinengo succedens apud ipsam M^{tem} tuam nostrum et huius s. sedis nuntium agat. Hortamur M^{tem} tuam . . . , ut . . . eum benigne excipere ac libenter audire fidemque illi de omnibus rebus habere velit.

Datum Rome apud s. Petrum etc. die XX nov. 1553 anno 4^o.

[Min. brev. Arm. 41, t. 69, n. 746. Secret Archives of the Vatican.]

21A. AVERARDO SERRISTORI TO COSIMO I., DUKE OF TUSCANY.³

1554, Januar. 14, Rom.

. . . La riforma va tuttavia inanzi et si tien per certo habbia a seguire poichè s'intende che in Hispagna et in Portogallo si

¹ See *supra*, p. 174.

² See *supra*, p. 225.

³ See *supra* p. 167.

risolvono d'osservare le determinazioni del concilio di Trento senza aspettare altra confirmatione del Papa sendovisi trovato in persona a farle, quando vi era legato, il che sarebbe non si facendo la riforma con poca dignità di S. B^{ne}1

[Orig. State Archives, Florence.]

21B. CARDINAL MORONE TO CARDINAL POLE.²

1553, December, 21, Rom.

La St^a del Papa tien per fermo per molte ragioni e scontr che la regina d'Inghilterra si debbia maritare col principe d Spagna e non gli dispiace tal matrimonio per beneficio de regno e per ridurlo in tutto alla vera religione et unione della chiesa giudicano che stando la regina senza marito sia istromento troppo debole a governare longamente quei popoli di natura feroci et instabili et assuefatti alle novità, massimamente intendendosi le divisioni intrinseche e subornationi degli esterni per le quali non crede che un rè del paese sia atto a ridurre quel regno all' obediencia ; anzi per vincere l'emulazioni che potrebbe avere e per stabilirsi crede saria necessario accomodarsi ; come per il contrario confida in Dio, che il principe di Spagna essendo catholico nato e nutrito et havendo la potenza sua vicina di Spagna e di Fiandra possa con maggior autorità introdurre l'unione alla Chiesa e difendere la regina dalli nemici interni e esterni.

Stando dunque queste cose Sua St^a giudica che saria non solo pericoloso il voler impedire tale matrimonio, ma ancora nocivo alla religione et all' interesse di questa S. Sede e però desidera che V. S. R^{ma} venga nella medesima opinione e resti di ciò persuasa et andando alla corte dell' Imperatore, come vuol che vadi contentandosi Sua Mt^a Ces^a, mostri con parole et effetti tal desiderio, non lasciando di far officio opportuno acciochè seguendo il matrimonio l'Imperatore non habbia da restare offeso e pigliar occasione di tener il regno in scisma.

Sua St^a mostrava di dubitare che quella non fosse per

¹ Cf. the *brief of 27. Februar., 1554 to the Spanish nuncio super controversis ortis inter prelatos et capitula ecclesiarum Hispaniae super sensu quorundam decretorum concilii Tridentini in which orders are given to ask the Chapters concerning complaints and to communicate these to the Prelates, so that they may adduce their counter reasons, and then everything is to be sent to the Pope so that he may arrange those matters in the work of reform. (Min. brev. Arm. 41, t. 70, n. 116. Secret Archives of the Vatican).

² See, *supra*, pp. 268, 278.

accomodarsi e spesso mi replicava che sarebbe impertinente cosa il volersi opporre al corso di un fiume impetuosissimo piacendogli quella sentenza : frustra niti et nil nisi odium quaerere extremae dementiae est. Io gli ho affermato, che V. S. R^{ma} è figlio di obbedienza e tenendo gli occhi a Dio, che quella in nessun tempo mai contrafaria alla volontà di S. B^{no}

Ha voluto solo che io sappia questa sua volontà et avvisi V. S. R^{ma} è voleva che io scrivessi in cifra non fidandosi ne de' suoi ne de' miei, ma ha dubitato che quella non havesse la cifra e però ho scritto a questo modo e dato la lettera in man propria di mons. Fabrizio, colla quale sarà il breve credenziale di Sua Stà.

Del parere mio non occorre che io dica altro essendo in ciò risoluta Sua B^{no} e convenendosi a lei obbedire. Solo l'avverisco di tener il segreto appresso di se come Sua Stà ordina per degni rispetti di tutti li potentati d'Italia e di fuori.

Il padre maestro del sacro palazzo nuovo arcivescovo di Consa verrà nuntio appresso l'Imperatore. Mi rallegro per amor di V. S. R^{ma} che avrà tal compagnia e certo è uomo di Dio e di gran prudenza, sebene esso si stima tanto poco che vi è stato da fare a quietarlo, ma alla volontà di Dio non si deve far resistenza.

[Copy. Corsini Library, Rome, Cod. 33 E. 19, 471—474.]

22. POPE JULIUS III. TO PETRO ANTONIO DI CAPUA, ARCH-BISHOP OF OTRANTO.¹

1554, Mai 31, Rom.

As we have summoned you for "Purgatio" on the sentence of the Inquisition and you have cleansed yourself here and have sworn that you have always agreed with the Catholic Faith and your four "compurgatores" have testified that you have always lived as a Catholic, while we have witnessed your pious life during the years of your residence in Rome, we receive you again into the fold of the Church and re-instate you in your honours.²

[Min. Brev. Arm. 41, t. 71, n. 318—319. Secret Archives of the Vatican.]

¹ See *supra*, p. 224.

² The case of the Archbishop of Otranto caused such a sensation that Morone in 1557 in his treatise on justification remarked : "La storia sua è nota" (CANTÙ, Eretici, II., 189); the case was then so far forgotten that DRUFFEL (III., 255) declared he was able to adduce nothing further. The first

23. SAFE-CONDUCT OF JULIUS III.¹

1551, October 20, Rom.

Universis et singulis praesentes literas inspecturis salutem etc. Cum dilecti filii nautae praesentium ostensores conducant ex portu Livornii ad hanc almam Urbem nostram lateres parvos quadratos et pictos ex Hispania adductos pro conficiendis pavimentis villae nostrae, idcirco subditis nostris sub indignationis et arbitrii nostri pena precipimus, non subditos vero hortamur et requirimus, ut ipsos nautas cum ipsis lateribus navigiis sarcinis rebus sociis et servientibus ad nos libere et secure sine aliquo impedimento sive pedaggi solutione venire permittant, quinimmo auxilium eisdem et favorem opportunum praestent.

Datum Romae apud sanctum Petrum etc. die xx octobris 1554 anno 5.^o

Io[annes].

[Min. Brev. Arm. 4I, t. 72, n. 640. Secret Archives of the Vatican.]

24. AVERARDO SERRISTORI TO COSIMO I., DUKE OF TUSCANY.²

1554, December 1, Rom.

. . . Lessesi di poi un' altra parte della reforma, oltre a quella del conclavi, ch'io scrissi a questi giorni all' E. V., et si ordinò che ne fussi dato una copia al Decano, perchè la mandassi a vedere et considerare a tutti i cardinali Vescovi, et una a S^{te} Croce, come primo prete che facessi il medesimo nell' ordine de' preti, nel quale ordine per essere maggiore che li altri, ne fu data un' altra copia al cardinale di Perugia perchè facessi il medesimo con quei preti che seggono di poi lui, et un'

mention is made in October, 1551, in the reports of the ambassador, that Julius was against the elevation of the Archbishop to the cardinalate on account of the investigation by the Inquisition (See letter of F. Gonzaga of Oct. 20th, 1551 in DE LEVA, V., 276). We learn from the *letter of Bart. Serristori, Archbp. of Trani, dat. Rome, Oct. 23rd, 1553 that the opposition of the Inquisition to the archbishop still continued at this time. On Dec. 14th, 1553 B. Serristori *reports that Manrique had lately been taking steps for the Cardinalate of the archbishop in the name of the Emperor, whereupon Julius III. resolved to hear the "most reverend members of the Inquisition." "A sitting of the Inquisition took place in presence of the Pope on Tuesday, in which the archbishop defended himself very well; in consequence of the secrecy of the deliberations, we can only learn that he is to be considered in another creation of Cardinals" (State Archives, Florence). Further authentic information is given by the above letter, hitherto unknown.

¹ See *supra*, p. 342.² See *supra*, p. 169.

altra al cardinale Farnese per fare il medesimo coi diaconi, i quali tutti cardinali l' hanno da considerare diligentissimamente et notare quel che a ciascuno paresse di levare o porre per poterla poi fermare in quel modo che harà da stare, et per non essere stabilita comandò S. Stà a tutti sotto pena di scomunicatione che non parlassino con persona di particolare alcuno. . . .

[Orig. State Archives, Florence.]

25. LUTHERANS IN ROME, 1552—1554.¹

The *Diario di Cola Coleine Romano records :

1552 a 6 Giugno in lunedì di Pasqua rosata furono menati 7 Luterani alla Minerva a ribenedire e v'erano due frati della Traspontina vestiti dell' ordine e preti secolari con tonica gialla e la croce roscia e li cardinali li rebenedissero e vi fu gran popolo.

1553 a 21 Marzo furono menati nella Minerva 11 Luterani e vi era Montalcino, predicatore di S. Apostoli.

1553 a di 4 Settembre Montalcino predicatore lo compagno [sic] et un tessitore di velluto² furono abbrugiati per Luterani³ nella Minerva essendosi letta la sentenza et alli 9 furono abbrugiati tutti li suoi libri.

1554 a 4 Novembre furono menati 16 Luterani alla Minerva e ritornarono alla fede.

[Chigi Library, Rome, Cod. N. II 32.]

26. CAMILLO CAPILUPI TO CARDINAL ERCOLE GONZAGA.⁴

1555, Februar. 16, Rom.

Yesterday there was a meeting of the Cardinals before the Pope. In essa si ragionò sopra la commissione che si ha da

¹ See *supra*, p. 218, I am not able to determine the real circumstances in connection with this arrest, announced by Serristori from Rome on April 29th, 1551 (*Hier. Borro d' Arezzo theologo, che serviva al card. di Ferrara : imprisoned on suspicion of heresy ; State Archives, Florence).

² Giov. Teodori da Perugia s. Orano 3 f ; cf. ELZE in the Riv. Crist., I., 272, *seqq.*

³ Concerning Giov. Buzio of Montalcino O. Min. Conv., his arrest and execution cf. ELZE in der Riv. Crist., *loc. cit.* ; FONTANA, II., 281 ; BRIGIDI, Fra Giov. Mollio, Siena, 1891 ; ORANO, I n ; BUSCHBELI, 215 ; PICCOLOMINI in Bullet. Senese XV., 296 *seq.*, 302 *seq.* ; XVII., 29 ; Atti di Romagna, XIX. (1901), 143, n. 3 ; CARCERERI, Riforma e Inquisizione nel ducato di Urbino, Verona, 1911, 7 *seq.*

⁴ See *supra*, p. 226.

dare al R^{ma} Morone intorno ad alcuni dubbii che S. S. R^{ma} ha mosso per conto delle cose della religione dei quali colli prime manderò una copia a V. S. Ill. ; quasi tutto il parlamento tocco al r^{mo} di Fano, al parere del quale S. Stà et tutti gli altri si rimisero senza replicare parola ; per la qual cosa S. S. R^{ma} n' ha riportato di molti lodi et da S. Stà et da tutti i r^{mi} che si trovarono presenti. . . .

[Orig. Gonzaga Archives, Mantua.]

27. FURTHERANCE OF THE RE-BUILDING OF ST. PETER'S BY JULIUS III.¹

How greatly Julius III. had the re-building of St. Peter's at heart, can be judged from the two Bulls already known up till now, that of July 31st, 1551 (Bull., VI., 445 *seqq.*) and of July 20th, 1552 (Compendium privilegiorum Rev. Fabricae S. Petri a Johanne Carolo Vespignanio absolut., nunc notis locupletat. a H. Baldassinio, Romae, 1762, 94 *seqq.*).² To these documents the following may be added, which I take from a manuscript acquired in Rome in 1901, which bears the title : *Privilegia, auctoritates, facultates indulgentiaequae fabricae basilicae principis apost. S. Petri de Urbe a quamplurimis Romanis pontificibus concessae et per sanct. dom. Paulum div. pro. papam quantum confirmatae.

Therein are the following documents, as far as I know still unprinted :

I. Iulius papa III. [1550, Juni 20, Rom.]

Ad perpetuam rei memoriam. Post nostram ad summi apostolatus officii assumptionem, toto cordis affectu semper mente revolvimus, celeberrimam divi Petri apostolorum principis basilicam, quae in admirabilem consurgit structuram, prout tenemur, debito fine terminare, ne, desertis aedificiis, quod iam factum est periret et tantum opus, tanta pecuniarum vi excitatum frustra rueret ; et cum Iulius II et successive alii praedecessores nostri suas et Sedi[s] Apostolicae facultates ad tantum opus perficiendum minime sufficere posse viderent,

¹ See *supra*, p. 333.

² Cf. also Bull. Bas. Vatic., III., 1, 19*seqq.* Concerning a commissary of the Fabrica S. Petri, who unfortunately sold Indulgences for money, see Atti d. Soc. Ligur., XXIV., 588 *seq.*

omnes christifideles coelestis thesauri premiis et aliis spiritualibus gratiis et donis toto nixu ad tam pium et laudabile opus invitaverunt, diversas indulgentias etiam plenarias et facultates tam eis quam collegio officialium ad curam dictae fabricae per sedem apostolicam deputatorum concedendo et innovando; Nosque aliorum praedecessorum nostrorum vestigia insecuti, indulgentias etiam plenarias et facultates, privilegia, praerogativas et indulta a praedecessoribus nostris concessa in crastinum nostrae ad summi apostolatus apicem assumptionis in genere revocaverimus et successive per quasdam alias nostras sub plumbo omnes indulgentias et nonnullas alias facultates durante anno iubilaei et deinde ad nostrum beneplacitum revocaverimus et suspenderimus: ne autem propter huiusmodi revocationes christifideles ad tam pium et laudabile opus tepidiores reddantur et fabrica interrupta pendere cogatur, motu proprio et ex certa scientia nostra indulgentias etiam plenarias, facultates, privilegia, praerogativas et in indulta praedicta per Iulium, Leonem, Adrianum, Clementem et Paulum praedecessores praefatos fabricae et collegio praefatis concessas et concessa, cum omnibus et singulis decretis et clausulis in singulis litteris desuper tam sub plumbo quam in forma brevis confectis, quarum tenores ac si de verbo ad verbum nihil penitus omisso inserti forent praesentibus haberi volumus pro expressis, auctoritate apostolica tenore praesentium confirmamus ac in pristinum et illud robur et statum, in quibus ante easdem revocationes quomodolibet erant, plenarie restituimus reponimus et reintegramus, ac plenarie restitutas, repositas et reintegratas existere decernimus, illasque et illa prout per dictos praedecessores nostros concessae et concessa sunt, in omnibus et per omnia innovamus; volumusque et declaramus quod collegium ipsum fabricae praefatae indulgentias etiam plenarias (non tamen durante praesenti anno iubilaei) necnon omnes alias facultates, privilegia, praerogativas et indulta praedicta praefato collegio concessas et concessa infuturum exercere possit, prout ante easdem revocationes exercere posse dignoscebatur; non obstantibus praemissis et aliis constitutionibus et ordinationibus apostolicis necnon omnibus illis quae in singulis litteris praedictis concessum fuit non obstare caeterisque contrariis quibuscunque. Verum quia difficile foret praesentes litteras ad singula quacunque loca, ad quae expediens

fuerit, deferre, volumus et dicta auctoritate decernimus, quod earum transumptis secretarii collegii praedicti manu subscriptis et sigillo dictae fabricae munitis, eadem prorsus fides indubia adhibeatur que praesentibus adhiberetur si essent exhibitae vel ostensae.

Datum Romae apud s. Petrum sub anulo piscatoris die XX mensis iunii MDL, pontificatus nostri anno 1.^o Blossius el[ectus] Fulgin. [Ms. cit. 138^b seq.]

2. Iulius papa III. [1552, Jan. 25, Rom^a]

Ad futuram rei memoriam. Cupientes necessariae instaurationi basilicae principis apostolorum de urbe taliter providere, ut exinde eius desiderata perfectio celerius subsequatur, necnon indulgentias, gratias, indulta et facultates aliis piis locis in eius praeiudicium concessa adeo moderare, quod propterea ad huiusmodi perfectionem ampliora christifidelium suffragia obvenire valeant; cum itaque nos alias seu nuper ex certis tunc expressis causis nonnulla, indulgentias, concessionem, gratias, indulta et facultates beatae Mariae de Iesu Redemptionis Captivorum nuncupatae in ecclesia domus S^{ti} Dominici civitatis Neapolitanae ordinis fratrum Praedicatorum ac montis pietatis eiusdem civitatis et certis aliis confraternitatibus necnon incurabilium praefatae civitatis ac certis aliis hospitalibus et piis locis, ita quod litterae desuper confectae sub quibusvis revocatione aut suspensione similium vel dissimilium indulgentiarum minime comprehendantur, et quoties revocari seu suspendi contingeret, toties in pristinum statum restitutae essent et esse conserentur, irritandi decreto desuper adiecto et alias sub certis modo et forma tunc expressis concesserimus et elargiti fuerimus; et sicut nobis innotuit, indulgentiae et concessionem, gratiae, indulta et facultates huiusmodi in maximum fabricae basilicae S^{ti} Petri de Urbe praeiudicium cesserint et cedant, et conveniens videatur, ut dicta fabrica pro illius et eiusdem basilicae, quae caeterarum caput et principalis existit, excellentia et dignitate ac urbis nostrae decore ac venustate in primis et ante omnia perficiatur et ad optatum finem deducatur et ab aliis locis minime quoad consequendas christifidelium elemosinas impediatur seu elemosinis ipsis ad illius perfectionem necessariis fraudetur: Nos igitur, indemnitati dictae fabricae ac illius perfectioni quantum in nobis est consulere volentes, motu proprio et ex certa

nostra scientia ac de apostolicae potestatis plenitudine omnia et singula indulgentias etiam plenarias, etiam illas a media quadragesima usque ad pascha inclusive ab ordinibus Mendicantium publicari solitas, ac alias concessionones, gratias, indulgentias et indulta ac etiam eligendi et deputandi confessores, qui absolvant aut alia faciant, ac reliquas omnes facultates huiusmodi indulgentias concernentes praefatis et quibusvis aliis confraternitatibus ac ecclesiis, monasteriis, hospitalibus et aliis etiam regularibus et piis locis in civitate praedicta et diocesi ac toto regno Neapolitano existentibus et sub quibus cunque invocationibus institutis, non tamen regnis Hispaniarum et locis in litteris Cruciatae et dictae fabricae comprahensis, ex quibusvis causis ac sub quibuscumque tenoribus, et formis etiam imperatoris, regnum, ducum vel aliorum principum intuitu seu contemplatione, etiam motu simili concessas et concessa, praeterquam quod ea, in quibus indulgentiae et facultates ipsae in aliqua sui parte iam sint sortitae effectum, ita ut praefatae et aliae confraternitates et ecclesiae, monasteria, hospitalia ac loca huiusmodi illis uti seu illa publicari tacere aut quaestas [sic] aliquas exercere minime possint seu debeant, a die mercurii quadragesimae usque ad octavam resurrectionis D. N. Iesu Christi inclusive uniuscuiusque anni dicta fabrica durante, nisi ad id deputatorum praefatae basilicae consensus accesserit, eorumque omnium vim et effectum per ipsum tempus auctoritate apostolica tenore praesentium suspendimus et suspensas esse, ac interim nullo modo publicari seu effectum sortiri aut locum sibi vindicare nec alicui suffragari debere, ac indulgentias confraternitati Redemptionis Captivorum concessas huiusmodi ullo unquam futuro tempore per commissarios seu alios quoscumque extra dictam civitatem Neapolitanam publicari nullatenus posse, necnon quidquid secus contigerit attentari irritum et inane decernimus et declaramus, ac eisdem confratribus et quibusvis personis pro confraternitatibus, monasteriis, ecclesiis, hospitalibus et locis prae dictis nunc et pro tempore deputatis, sub nostrae indignationis, necnon excommunicationis latae sententiae eo ipso per contrafacientes incurrendis poenis, ne durante dicto tempore de huiusmodi indulgentiis, concessionibus, gratiis, indultis et facultatibus ac quaestis se intromittere quoquo modo audeant seu praesumant, districtius inhibemus, non obstantibus praemissis ac quibusvis constitutionibus

et ordinationibus apostolicis caeterisque contrariis quibuscumque. Volumus autem ut praesentium transumptis manu notarii ipsius fabricae subscriptis et sigillo collegii dictae fabricae munitis eadem prorsus fides adhibeatur, quae eisdem originalibus adhiberetur, si forent exhibitae vel ostensae.

Datum Romae apud s. Petrum sub anulo piscatoris die xxv ianuarii MDLII pontificatus nostri anno secundo.

S. Cervinus.

A. della Torre. [Ms. cit. p. 147 *seqq.*]

3. Breve confirmationis abdicationis quaestarum S. Antonii de Sancto Antonio Viennensi in favorem fabricae basilicae principis apostolorum de Urbe. Inc.: Regimini militantis ecclesiae . . .

Dat. Romae 1553, Dec. 15. [Ms. cit. p. 147 *seqq.*]

4. Breve S. D. N. D. Iulii divina providentia papae III confirmationis indulgentiarum, privilegiorum, gratiarum et aliarum facultatum in favorem fabricae basilicae principis apostolorum de Urbe. Inc.: Cupientes ea . . .

Dat. ut. s. [Ms. cit. 151 *seqq.*]

5. Breve Iulii III. revocatorium omnium et singularum quaestarum et commissariorum in favorem fabricae basilicae principis apostolorum de Urbe. Inc.: Si in universa christi-fidelium templa . . .

Dat. Romae 1553, Dec. 12. [Ms. cit. p. 154 *seqq.*]

6. Breve S. D. N. D. Iulii divina providentia papae III confirmatorium revocationis quaestarum et indulgentiarum quarumcunque, cum mandato ordinariis, ut non permittant aliquas quaestas exerceri nec indulgentias publicari, nisi prius per suas litteras earum copiam R. P. D. deputatis fabricae transmiserint et ab eis responsum, cui omnino parere teneantur, habuerint, Inc.: Decet Rom. Pontificem . . .

Dat. Romae 1554, Apr. 6. [Ms. cit. p. 162 *seqq.*]

7. Motuproprio „Cum nos,“ entitled “Suspensio indulgentiarum durante quadragesima in favorem fabricae.”

Dat. Romae VIII. Cal. febr. a° secundo (25 Januar., 1552). [Ms. cit. p. 174^b *seqq.*]

28. ORDINANCES FOR REFORM BY POPE JULIUS III.¹

1550.

* Min. brev. Arm. 41, t. 49, n. 341 : *Card. Sfondrato (Warrant to proceed against the 'Exempts' of his diocese of Cremona, and to reform the monasteries), April 23. T. 56, n. 420 : * Paulo Nicolino canon. Florent. (Visitation of the monastery of S. Mariae de Balneo, O. Camaldul.), Mai 8 ; n. 538 : * Archiepisc. Salzburg and by other German bishops (Warrant to reform the 'Exempts' during the Visitation), Juni 13. T. 57, n. 740 : * Viceleg. Bononiae et priori gen. S. M. Servor. (Reform of convents), August 15 ; n. 824 *Isidoro ep. Fulgin. (Reform of secular and regular clergy), September 15 ; n. 827 : * Vic. Archiep. Neapolit. (Reform of the nuns of S. Petri, O. S. B.), September 18 ; n. 832 : * Archiep. Mediol. (Warrants against Exempts), September 20. T. 58, n. 944 : * Generali et visitorib. O. Camald. (Visitation the monastery of S. Mariae terrae Balnei, O. Camald.), November 10.² (Secret Archives of the Vatican).

1551.

* Min. brev. Arm. 41, t. 59, n. 1 : Episcop. Matiscon. (Reform of the convent and priory of S. Petri Matiscon., O. S. Aug.), Januar. 1 ; n. 19 : * Episc. Litterensi [Lettere] (Warrant for reform and punishment of exempts), January 12 ; n. 146 : Card. Compostellan. (Reform of the Spanish College in Bologna), Mai. 10 ; n. 148 : * Imperatori (Punishment of clergy in the Balearic Isles), Mar. 11 ; n. 156 : * Provinciali O. Pr. ref. prov. Rom. (Reform of the convent of S. Dominici de Campo regio in Siena), Mar. 12 ; n. 214 : Bull (Punishment of secular clergy not wearing clerical dress), Mar. 25. T. 60, n. 256 : * Mandatum iudicibus (Punishment of Vagrant Carthusians of las Cuevas extra muros Ispalen.), April 10 ; n. 508 : * Christof. Archiep. Bremen. (Reform of Convents), Juni 20. T. 62, n. 978 : * Episc. Brixien. (Reform of the Poor Clares, vet^{is} civit. Brix.), October 1 ; n. 1055 : Capellano

¹ See *supra*, p. 162.

² Concerning the reform of the convent of the Minerva in Rome arranged in June, 1550, see MASSARELLI, 177. A document of October 20th, 1550, regarding reform in the kingdom of Poland is in THEINER, Mon. Pol., II., 572.

maiori regis Portug. (against frivolous imposition of the Interdict), December 31. ¹ *loc. cit.*

1552.

* Min. brev. Arm. 41, t. 63, n. 37 : * Nuntio Venet. (Reform of the convent of S. Mariae Servor. et Iacobi della Giudecca), Januar. 14 ; n. 108 : * Card. de Mendoza (Reform of convents of nuns in the diocese of Burgos), Februar. 15. T. 64, n. 242 : * Card. Morono (Reform of the O. Eremit. S. Hieron.), April 12 ; n. 243 : * Generali O. Eremit. S. Hieron. (as n. 242), April 12 ; n. 288 : Generali O. Praed. (Correction of missals and breviaries of the Order), Mai 3 ; n. 369 and 370 : Philippo, princ. Hisp. and Card. Poggio (Reform of the fratres O. Eremit. S. August.), Mai 28 ; n. 428 : Card. I. de Monte et Alex. Campegio (Reform of convents of nuns in Bologna), Juni 22. T. 65, n. 451 : * Card. Neapolit. (Warrant for Reform of exempt monasteries), Juli 1 ; n. 476 : * Reform of the nuns of S. Mariae Gaietani O. Cist., Juli 11 ; n. 530 : Briefs and * Facultates Sylvestro Landino et Emanueli de Montemaiori S. J. for reform in Corsica, August 5 ; n. 566 : Cocciano, protonotario (Reform of Poor Clares at Spoleto), August 25 ; n. 576 : * Card. Morono (Reform of all convents O. Heremit. S. Hieron.), August 31 ; n. 615 : * Card. de Durantibus (Prohibition to receive girls under 15 in the convents at Brescia), September 20. T. 66, n. 643 : * Imperatori (Reform of monasteries in Lorraine and the Netherlands), October 1 ; n. 685 : Episc. Curiensi, nuntio apud Grisones (Reform of the clergy), October 15, *loc. cit.*

1553.

* Min. brev. Arm. 41, t. 67, n. 183 : * Card. Poggio, leg. Hispaniae (Reform of Poor Clares), Mar. 12 ; n. 201 : * Archiep. Taurin. (Reform of Poor Clares in Turin T. 69, n. 521 : * Card.

¹ In the *Brevia Iulii III.* t. 2 I find moreover the following addenda for 1551 : *Cornelio episc. Bitunt. (Reform of the clergy), Mar. 1 ; *I. Bapt. episc. Venaf. (Reform of seculars and regulars) Mar. 18 ; * Reform of the Benedictine monastery, S. Maria de Brano in Naples, Mar. 18 ; *Generali et visit. congreg. Camaldul., November 10, Concerning Julius III. and the reform of monasteries in Genoa see ROSI, *Le monache*, in the *Atti d. Soc. Ligure*, XXVII., 195 and ROSI, *Genova e la Chiesa*, 10. The strict Rule approved in 1551 by J. B. Galetti "magister domus Iulii III." for the Ethiopian monastery S. Stefano dei Mori : S. CHAINE, *Un monastere éthiopien à Rome au XV. et XVI siècle*, in the *Mélanges de la Faculté orient. de Beyrouth*, V. (1910), 19 *seqq.*

Pisano, episc. Tarvis. (Punishment of a dissolute Abbess, O. S. B.), August 3 ; n. 699 : Francisco episc. Pacensi (Reform of seculars and regulars), October 24 ; n. 709 : * Card. Pisano (Reform of nuns), October 28 ; n. 761 : * Card. Neapolit. (Reform of nuns), November 27¹ *loc. cit.*

1554.

* Min. brev. Arm. 41, t. 70, n. 201 : * Castellano episc. Placent. (against vagrant monks), April 12. T. 71, n. 268 : * Episc. Bamberg. (Reform of monasteries), Mai 15 ;² n. 306 : * Archiep. Mediolan. (against vagrant nuns), Mai 28 ; n. 381 : * Generali O. Crucifer. (Reform of the Order), Juni 20. T. 72, n. 568 : * Prohibition of women entering the Charterhouse near Asti, September 20 ; n. 693 : Christophoro Paduano generali O. S. August. (against vagrants), November 23 ; n. 729 : Barth. Iano, Maceratensi, O. Min. conv. prof. in theol. (Reform of monasteries in Burgundy, Aragon, Portugal), December 26, *loc. cit.*

1555.

Arm. 44, t. 4, n. 16 : * Baptista Buttinoro (Visitation of churches in Corsica), Januar. 26, *loc. cit.*

¹ In Format. I Iulii III., Min. brev. 60 there are also the following documents which rightly belong here : 45° : * Hieronymo archiep. Ianuen. (Faculties for Reform), 1553, Mart. 3 ; 48° : Paulo Sadoletto ep. Carpent. (Warrant against clerics and exempts), Mart. 8 ; 72° : * Archiep. Hispal. (Reform of clerics), April 7 ; 96 : Card. Pacheco (Reform of his diocese), Mai 24.

² In the 'Min. brev.' the mandate of Julius III. to Melchior, bishop of Würzburg about the visitation of all monasteries of monks and nuns in his diocese as " non modica scandala " had come to his ears, etc., May 15, 1554. A single sheet probably printed in Augsburg ; a fine initial at the beginning.

INDEX OF NAMES IN VOL. XIII.

- ACCOLTI, Cardinal, 364.
 Adamas Sagat (Negus of Abyssinia), 313 n. 2.
 Adrian VI., Pope, 297, 419, 453.
 Agostini, Antonio (Bishop of Lerida, nuncio to Ferdinand I.), 154 n. 1, 169 n. 4, 289.
 Aguilera, J. de (physician), 142 n. 3.
 Alba, Duke of, 10.
 Albani, G. (author), 331 n. 2.
 Albernoz, Rodrigo de, 302 n. 4.
 Alberteschi, Family of the, 388.
 Aldrovandi, Ulisse (naturalist), 216, 357, 366, 367, 375 n. 2, 390, 395, 397, 421, 422, 423.
 Alepo, Salvatore (Archbishop of Sassari), 100, 109.
 Alessandrino, Fra Michele, *see* Ghislieri.
 Alexander II., Pope, 411.
 Alexander VI., Pope, 177, 364, 370, 375, 383, 385, 389, 401.
 Alfonso, Infante of Portugal, Cardinal, 3, 25.
 Aliotti, Pier Giovanni, 341.
 Altoviti, Bindo (banker), 371.
 Amaseo, Romolo (humanist, papal secretary), 74, 327.
 Amboise, George d', Cardinal, 6, 20, 27.
 Ammanati, Bartolomeo (sculptor), 340, 341, 345 n. 1, 347, 352, 353.
 Amyot, Jacques (French Envoy), 106.
 Angelico, Fra (painter), 420.
 Angelis, P. A. de (Bishop of Nepi), 54 n. 1, 133 n. 3.
 Anguillara, Family of the, 388.
 Anjiro, Paul, S. J. (missionary), 316.
 Anton (Chinese attendant on St. Francis Xavier), 320 n. 1, 321.
 Antonio of Madrid, S. J., 187.
 Aquila, Branconio dell', 364, 377, 387.
 Aramont (French envoy), 143.
 Arezzo, H. Borro d'. (heretic), 451 n. 1.
 Aretino, Pietro, 329, 330, 332.
 Ariosto, Lodovico, 65.
 Armagnac, George d' (Bishop of Rodez), Cardinal, 6.
 Arrivabene, G. Fr., 52 n. 4.
 Arundel, Lord, 261.
 Asnaf Sagat (Negus of Abyssinia), 313 n. 2.
 Aspera, Francesco d' (treasurer to Julius III.), 375 n. 1.
 Ataide, Alvaro (Commandant of Malacca), 319, 320, 323.
 Aurelius Novocomensis, 224 n. 2.
 Aversa, Matteo da, 222.
 Avila, Luis de (Imperial envoy), 58, 78.
 Ayala, 24 n. 4.
 Atracino, Sebastiano, 63 n. 5.
 BACCI, Andrea n. 3.
 Badhorn, Leopold (agent of the Elector Maurice of Saxony at the Council of Trent), 115, 118, 119.
 Baglioni, Family of the, 53.
 Baglioni, Rodolfo, 140 n. 1.
 Balneo, G. F. de, Count, 134 n. 2.

- Barbaro (Venetian envoy), 241.
 Barga, da (physician), 433.
 Baronino da Casale, Bartolomeo (architect), 8 n. 4, 341.
 Baronius, Cesare (the future Cardinal), 177.
 Barreto, Nuñez, S. J. (Patriarch of Abyssinia), 313.
 Basso, Girolamo, Cardinal, 420.
 Beccadelli, Lodovico (nuncio), 211, 328.
 Belisarius, 392.
 Bellarmine, Francis, S. J. (the future Cardinal), 177.
 Bellay, Eustache du (Bishop of Paris), 205, 206, 207.
 Bellay, Jean du (Bishop of Paris), Cardinal, 6, 19, 25, 141 n. 2, 152 n. 1, 407.
 Bellay, Joachim du, 406.
 Benavente, Toribio da (Motolinia), Franciscan missionary, 303, 306.
 Bencio, Trifone (secretary), 74.
 Benedict XIII., Pope, 426 n. 1.
 Bernard (a Japanese, companion to St. Francis Xavier), 323.
 Bernardo of Viterbo, Fra, 223.
 Bernini, Giov. Lorenzo (architect and sculptor), 370.
 Bertano, Pietro (Bishop of Fano, nuncio), Cardinal, 80, 81, 93, 107, 122 n. 2, 125, 136, 171, 172, 173, 452.
 Bessarion, Cardinal, 342.
 Beuerlin (protestant theologian), 125.
 Bevilacqua, Family of the, 395.
 Biagio, Girolamo (envoy from Bologna), 59 n. 3.
 Billick, Eberhard (theologian), 114.
 Bini, Family of the, 375.
 Biondo, Flavio (humanist), 394.
 Blado, Antonio (printer), 332, 383.
 Boccaccio, Leonardo, 61.
 Bocchi, Achille, 328 n. 4.
 Bohemia, Queen of, 103 n. 1.
 Boleyn Anne, 245.
 Boniface VIII., Pope, 411.
 Bonner, Edmund (Bishop of London), 240, 246, 287.
 Borba, Diego de, 308 n. 1.
 Borgia, Francis, S. J. (Duke of Gandia), 177-179, 186, 187, 209.
 Borromei, Family of the, 343 n. 1.
 Borromeo, St. Charles, 177.
 Borgia, Lucrezia, 397.
 Boschi, Fabrizio (painter), 49 n. 1, 338.
 Bourbon, Louis de, Cardinal, 6, 20, 30, 33.
 Bourne (court chaplain), 246.
 Bramante, Donato (architect), 337, 365, 366, 370, 371, 421.
 Brandolini, Raphael [Lippo] (humanist, tutor to Pope Julius III.), 46, 326.
 Brenz, Johann (protestant theologian), 125.
 Broet, Paschasius, S. J. (Provincial of the Jesuits in France), 205-207.
 Brueghel, Peter (painter and engraver), 389.
 Bruslart, Noel (procurator-general of the French Parliament), 204, 205.
 Bufalini, Leonardo (artist), 357, 363, 371, 374, 375 n. 2, 379, 386, 390.
 Bullinger, Johann Heinrich (Swiss reformer), 219, 243.
 Buonanni, Benedetto (Florentine envcy, conclavist to Card. Toledo), 21, 22, 130, 160.
 Burchard, Johannes (Master of ceremonies to Alexander VI.), 384, 401.
 Bucer, Martin, O. P. (afterwards protestant theologian), 239, 242.
 Buzio, Giovanni (Minorite), 218.
 CACCIALUPI, Family of the, 381.
 Calandra, Endimio, 36 n. 2, 43.
 Calandra, Sabino (Mantuan envoy), 29 n. 1, 50 n. 1.

- Calvi, Giovanni da, O. S. F., 378, 425.
- Calvin, John, 221, 239, 242, 243, 270 n. 3, 296 n. 2.
- Camaiani, Onofrio, 149.
- Camaiani, Pietro (Papal chamberlain), 93, 135, 136, 139.
- Campegio, Alessandro, Cardinal, 173.
- Campegio, Giambattista (Bishop of Maiorca), 109.
- Canano, Giulio (secretary), 74, 75, 95 n. 1.
- Canisius, Peter, S. J., 182 n. 2, 200-203.
- Cannani, G. (physician), 142 n. 3.
- Cano, Melchior, O. P., 108.
- Capilupi, Camillo, 166 n. 3.
- Capilupi, Ippolito, 130.
- Capodiferro, Girolamo (Datary) Cardinal, 6, 10, 21, 30, 41, 149, 350, 387.
- Capranica, Family of the, 400.
- Capua, Pietro Antonio de (Archbishop of Otranto), 171, 223, 224, 449 n. 2.
- Caracciolo, Galeazzo (Marquis of Vico, nephew of Card. Carafa), 221.
- Carafa, Gian Pietro (Bishop of Chieti, Archbishop of Naples), Cardinal (later Pope Paul IV.), 6, 12, 16, 18, 21-27, 30-33, 57, 63, 70, 71, 78, 88, 155, 158, 160, 165, 183, 208, 210, 213, 216, 217, 220, 222, 338 n. 2, 397, 412 n. 4, 435.
- Carafa, Oliviero, Cardinal, 379, 396.
- Caravaggio, Polidoro da (painter), 376, 377.
- Cardelli, Family of the, 351.
- Carew, 263.
- Carissimo, Pietro Maria, 29 n. 1.
- Carne, Sir Edward (English envoy), 288.
- Carnero, Melchior, S. J. (Coadjutor Bishop of Abyssinia), 313.
- Caro, Annibale, 221 n. 4.
- Carpi, Girolamo da (painter), 341, 353.
- Carpi, Pio Rodolfo da (Bishop of Faenza and Girgenti), Cardinal, 6, 10, 16, 17, 25, 31, 33, 42, 45 n. 2, 80 n. 3, 141 n. 2, 151, 168, 217, 228, 229, 396, 397, 402, 422.
- Casal, Gaspar do (Bishop of Funchal), 290.
- Casas, Bartolomé de las, O. P. (Bishop of Chiapa), 304, 305.
- Castellesi, Adriano, Cardinal, 364.
- Castner, Kaspar, S. J. (Missionary), 321 n. 1.
- Castriotto, Jacopo Fusti (architect), 354 n. 3.
- Castro, Alfonso de, O. S. F., 281.
- Castro, Duchess of (mother of Ottavio Farnese), 133.
- Catanei, Vannozza de', 383, 384.
- Catharinus, Ambrosius (tutor to Julius III. in Siena), 46 n. 2.
- Catherine, Queen of Bosnia, 394.
- Catherine, Queen of England (wife of Henry VIII.), 244, 253, 254.
- Catherine, Queen of France (wife of Henry II.), *see de' Medici*
- Catherine, Queen of Poland, Archduchess of Austria, 236.
- Cavino (medallist), 49 n. 1.
- Cecchi (engraver), 48 n. 5.
- Cellini, Benvenuto, 56 n. 2, 354, 376.
- Cenci, Family of the, 385, 401.
- Cervini, Alessandro (half-brother to Marcellus II.), 177 n. 1.
- Cervini, Marcello (Bishop of Nicastro, Cardinal, afterwards Pope Marcellus II.), 2 n. 1, 3, 6, 10, 12, 16, 17, 20-22, 25, 40, 48, 78, 88, 139, 159, 160, 163-165, 217,

- 219, 220-222, 225, 228,
229, 327, 334, 436, 450.
Cesati, Alessandro, "Il Greco"
(Master of the Mint), 62 n.
5, 354.
Cesi, Family of the, 365, 423.
Cesi, Federigo, Cardinal, 6, 15,
365.
Cesi, Paolo Emilio, Cardinal,
364.
Chambre, Philippe de la, Car-
dinal, 6, 7, 20, 27.
Charles V., Emperor, 3-5, 10-12,
18-22, 24 n. 4, 31, 33 n. 1,
39, 41, 44, 54, 55, 60, 77-
80, 82-85, 89-95, 97, 101,
107, 111, 114, 120, 124-130,
133-139, 143-146, 148, 149,
151-153, 170, 171, 174,
178, 179, 209, 224-229, 231,
245, 250, 256-260, 265,
267, 269, 272, 273, 276,
278-283, 286, 298, 301,
353, 356 n. 3, 378, 408, 448.
Châtillon, Cardinal, 6, 7, 19.
Chigi, Family of the, 421.
Chigi, Agostino, 389.
Christian III., King of Den-
mark, 259.
Christopher, Duke of Wurtem-
berg, 115, 117, 125.
Cibo, Innocenzo, Cardinal 3 n. 2,
6, 7, 12, 18, 20, 23, 57, 158,
435.
Cicada, Giambattista (Bishop
of Albenga), Cardinal, 146,
165, 173.
Ciocchi del Monte, *see* Monte.
Claudius (Negus of Abyssinia),
313 n. 2.
Clement VI., Pope, 35.
Clement VII., Pope 7, 11, 47,
212, 214, 290, 340, 366,
368, 399, 404, 421, 425,
441, 453.
Clement XII., Pope, 394.
Clement XIV., Pope, 343 n. 1.
Cleve, Hendrik van (painter),
363, 366.
Cock, Hieronymus (painter and
chalcographer), 400, 401.
Coleine, Cola (chronicler), 218,
451.
Colini, G., 343 n. 1.
Colonna, Family of the, 396,
402, 409, 424.
Colonna, Ascanio, 9, 53, 346.
Colonna, Camillo, 9.
Colonna, Giacomo, Cardinal,
412.
Colonna, Pietro, Cardinal, 412.
Colonna, Prospero, Cardinal,
396.
Colonna, Vittoria, 395, 397.
Commendone, Giovanni Fran-
cesco (Bishop of Zante),
Cardinal, 251-253, 259 n. 2,
270.
Condivi, Ascanio, 332, 337.
Condulmero, Francesco (nephew
of Eugenius IV.), Cardinal,
383.
Conti, Family of the, 361, 409.
Conti, Sigismondo de', 336 n. 1.
Corgna, Ascanio della (com-
mander of the Papal
guards, son of Francia,
nephew of Julius III.), 66,
69, 97 n. 4, 103 n. 1, 133 n.
2, 148 n. 1.
Corgna, Francia della (brother-
in-law to Julius III., hus-
band of Jacopa del Monte),
46, 69.
Corgna, Fulvio della (Bishop of
Perugia, brother of As-
canio), Cardinal, 69, 148
n. 1, 173, 353 n. 1, 450.
Corgna, Jacopa della (sister to
Julius III.), 46, 69.
Cornaro, Andrea (Archbishop of
Spalato), Cardinal, 6, 41.
Cornaro, Luigi, Cardinal, 174.
Correa, 293 n. 3.
Cortese, Cardinal, 380.
Cortese, Ersilia, *see* Monte.
Cortez, Fernando, 296, 297, 300.
Cosimo I. (Duke of Tuscany),
see Medici.
Courtenay, Edward, Earl of
Devonshire, 259, 260, 261,
263, 267, 288.
Coverdale, Miles, 247.
Cranmer, Thomas (Archbishop
of Canterbury), 239, 241-
243, 247, 274.

- Crawford, John, 324.
 Crema, Fra Battista da, 212, 441.
 Crescentius, Nicholas, 392.
 Crescenzi, Marcello (Bishop of Marsico), Cardinal, 41, 57, 76, 78, 88, 91, 92, 97, 99, 100, 103, 104, 108, 111, 115-117, 120, 121, 123, 127, 128, 131, 132 n. 1, 135, 158, 160, 161, 170, 210, 217, 327, 435.
 Criminalis, Antonio, S. J., 308 n. 1.
 Crispi, Tiberio, Cardinal, 6.
 Crivelli, Gianpietro (goldsmith), 377, 378, 425.
 Croft, 263.
 Cueva, Bartolomé de la, Cardinal, 5, 41, 42.
 Cupis, Domenico de (Bishop of Camerino), Cardinal 6, 7, 8 n. 3, 12, 16, 17, 20 n. 2, 21, 23, 25, 27, 28, 30-33, 42, 57, 63, 78, 88, 146, 151, 158-160, 167 n. 1, 210, 379, 435.
 Cupis, Francesca de, 379 n. 2.
 Cyprian, Alfonso, 311.
 DANDINO, Girolamo (Bishop of Imola), Cardinal, 73, 75, 76, 95, 99, 103 n. 1, 149, 151, 173, 251-253, 256, 257, 270.
 Dandolo, Matteo (Venetian envoy), 28, 69.
 Danti, Vincenzo, 49 n. 1.
 Davidico, Lorenzo, 331.
 Day (Bishop of Chichester), 240, 247.
 Delfino, Zaccaria (Nuncio), 167 n. 2, 225, 226.
 Delgadillo, 303 n. 2.
 Delphinus, J. A. (theologian), 122 n. 2.
 Doménech, Jerónimo, S. J., 186, 195.
 Dominic of Betanzos, O. P., 304.
 Dominico of Basana, 219 n. 1.
 Doria, Girolamo, Cardinal, 3 n. 2, 6, 7.
 Dosio, Giov. Ant., 364 n. 2.
 Dragut (corsair), 143.
 Dryander, Francis (Fr. de Enzinas), 242.
 Dudley, Guilford (son of the Earl of Warwick), 244.
 Duranti, Durante de' (Bishop of Alghero), Cardinal, 6.
 Dzierzowski, Nicolas (Archbishop of Gnesen), 236.
 EDWARD VI. (King of England), 237, 241 n. 4, 242, 243, 247, 254, 259 n. 1, 272, 274, 282.
 Egger, Hermann, 358 n. 1, 360 n. 1.
 Egmont, Lamoral, Count of (Imperial envoy to Mary of England), 262.
 Eguia, d', S. J., 186.
 Elizabeth of England (daughter of Henry VIII.), 244, 252, 263, 271 n. 1.
 Emanuel, Philibert (Duke of Savoy), 259.
 Erasmus, 329.
 Erasso (Imperial envoy), 280.
 Este, Ercole II. d' (Duke of Ferrara), 30 n. 3, 58, 68 n. 3, 222, 417.
 Este, Ippolito d', Cardinal, 6, 8, 17, 20, 30, 35 n. 1, 39, 40, 81, 86 n. 2, 96, 145, 150, 372, 397, 422, 451 n. 1.
 Estouteville, Cardinal, 378.
 Eugenius III., Pope, 412.
 Eugenius IV., Pope, 368, 383, 384.
 FABRIANO, Gentile da (painter) 412.
 Fabricius, G., 414 n. 2.
 Fagius, Paul (Hebraist, reformer), 242.
 Fanino of Ferrara, 218, 219 n. 1.
 Fanneman, Balthasar (co-adjutor Bishop of Mayence), 104.
 Fantuccio, Federigo (papal envoy), 149.
 Farnese, Family of the, 138, 382.
 Farnese, Alessandro, Cardinal

- (son of Pier Luigi), 2 n. 1, 6, 7 n. 1, 15-17, 25, 26, 30, 31, 37, 38, 40-42, 44, 73, 74, 94, 132, 140, 145 n. 4, 381, 386, 387, 389, 409, 451.
- Farnese, Costanza, 376.
- Farnese, Margherita (wife of Ottavio), 399.
- Farnese, Orazio (Duke of Castro, commander of the Papal troops), 9, 30 n. 3, 37, 38, 133, 138.
- Farnese, Ottavio (son of Pier Luigi, Duke of Castro), 5, 11, 30 n. 3, 37, 38, 53, 55, 59, 92-98, 101, 105, 129, 130, 132, 136, 138, 152 n. 1, 155, 399, 409.
- Farnese, Ranuccio (Archbishop of Naples), Cardinal, 6, 7 n. 1, 37, 38, 40, 132, 404 n. 3.
- Fascitelli, Onorato, 328.
- Fauno, Lucio, 405.
- Fedrio, Sigismondo, of Diruta (Franciscan—Conventual), 100.
- Ferdinand of Aragon (Archbishop of Saragossa), 189.
- Ferdinand I. (King of the Romans), 58, 78, 104, 111, 120, 164, 172 n. 3, 201-203, 210, 225, 229, 259.
- Feria, Count of (Spanish envoy in England), 209.
- Fernandez, Juan, S. J. (companion of St. Francis Xavier), 316 n. 3, 317.
- Ferrara, Duke of, *see* Este.
- Fichard, Johann (jurist), 358, 359, 364-371, 374, 378, 381, 393, 396, 400, 403, 406-408, 412, 419.
- Fieschi, Cardinal, 381.
- Filarete, Ant. Franc. (architect and sculptor), 368.
- Filonardi, Ennio, Cardinal, 3 n. 2, 6, 17, 18, 19.
- Fiordibello, Ant. (Papal secretary), 250.
- Firmanus, Giov. Franc. (Papal master of ceremonies), 2 n. 1, 29 n. 4, 415 n. 3.
- Firmanus, Ludovicus (master of ceremonies), 415 n. 3.
- Fisher, John (Bishop of Rochester), Cardinal, 249, 251.
- Flach, George (suffragan Bishop of Würzburg), 103.
- Florimonte, Galeazzo (Bishop of Sessa and Aquino), 74 327.
- Fonseca, Antonio (Archbishop of Seville), 290.
- Fonseca, Johannes (Bishop of Castelmare), 109.
- Fontana, Prospero, 342, 352.
- Forca Palena, Niccolò di (hermit), 390.
- Fracastoro, Girolamo, 328.
- Francis, The Dauphin (Son of Henry II.), 260.
- Francis I. (King of France), 80.
- Francis Xavier, St. (S. J.), 186, 308-325.
- Frangipani, Family of the, 408, 409.
- Frederick of Brandenburg (Archbishop of Magdeburg and Halberstadt), 110.
- Fregimilia, F. (physician), 142 n. 3.
- Frontinus, 348.
- Fuga (architect), 412.
- Fugger, Family of the, 371.
- Fusconi, Franceso (court-physician to Paul III.), 387.
- GABRIELLI, Scipione, 13 n. 3.
- Gaddi, Giovanni (banker), 371, 375.
- Gaddi, Niccolo, Cardinal, 3 n. 2, 6, 7, 15, 18, 41.
- Gaetani, Family of the, 389, 409.
- Gaetani, N., Cardinal, 150 n. 1.
- Galle, Theodore (engraver), 364 n. 2.
- Galletti, Giovan Battista (maestro di camera), 375.
- Galli, Family of the, 382.
- Garces, Julian (Bishop of Tlaxcala), 303, 305.
- Gardiner, Stephen (Bishop of Winchester), 240, 247, 259,

- 261-264, 267, 274, 281,
284-287.
- Garimberti, Girolamo (Bishop
of Gallese), 423.
- Gentile, Giulio, 24 n. 5, 30 n. 1.
- Gerona, Saturnio (poet and
humanist), 403.
- Ghislieri, Michele, Cardinal (In-
quisitor-general, Bishop of
Sutri, afterwards Pope Pius
V.), 219, 220, 222, 409.
- Gianettini, Fulgenzio, 154 n. 2.
- Giliis, Silvester de, 139 n. 3.
- Giotto (painter and architect),
368.
- Giovenale, Latino, 387.
- Giovio, Paolo (Bishop of
Nocera, historian), 159,
329.
- Givry, de, Cardinal, 3.
- Glogowski, Peter (Polish envoy)
234, 235.
- Gomez de Monte Mayor, Eman-
uel, S. J. (Papal commis-
sary), 194.
- Gomez de Silva, Ruiz, 209.
- Gonçalves de Camera, Luis,
S. J., 182 n. 2.
- Gonzaga, Family of the, 340.
- Gonzaga, Aloysius, 176.
- Gonzaga, Ercole, Cardinal, 3 n.
2, 4, 6, 7, 16, 19, 29, 37,
39, 41, 42, 52, 145 n. 4, 166
n. 3, 174.
- Gonzaga, Ferrante (governor of
Milan, brother to Card.
Ercole), 4, 19, 93, 130-132,
136, 139.
- Granvelle, Nicholas Perrenot de
(Imperial Chancellor), 4,
84, 209, 252, 278, 280, 283.
- Grassi, Achille de' (Bishop of
Montefiascone), 103 n. 1,
123, 124, 130 n. 4, 143, 146,
211.
- Gregory IX., Pope, 362 n. 2.
- Gregory X., Pope, 11, 16, 17,
32, 33.
- Gregory XIII., Pope, 363 n. 2,
380, 412 n. 4.
- Gregory XV., Pope, 325.
- Gregory XVI., Pope, 343 n. 1.
- Gregorianozi, Paul (Bishop of
Agram, 2nd envoy from
Ferdinand I.), 107.
- Gregorini (architect), 412.
- Grey, Jane, Lady, 244, 246,
259, 263, 266.
- Grey, Thomas (brother to the
Duke of Suffolk), 266.
- Grimani, Giovanni (Patriarch of
Venice), Cardinal, 224, 350.
- Groliero, Cesare (secretary of
state), 74 n. 3.
- Gropper, Johannes, Cardinal,
114.
- Gualterius de Brevibus, Peter
Paul (conclavist to Card.
Maffei), 2 n. 1, 40 n. 2.
- Gualterius, Sebastian (conclav-
ist to Card. Aless. Farnese,
nuncio), 2 n. 1, 152, 232.
- Guise, Charles de, Cardinal of
Lorraine, 6, 19, 20, 22, 25,
26, 30, 31, 32, 35, 38-42,
44, 83 n. 2, 102, 172, 203,
204, 208, 350, 447.
- Guise, Louis de, Cardinal
(brother to the Card. of
Lorraine), 172, 174, 175.
- Gundisalvo, F., S. J., 190 n. 2.
- Guzman, 303 n. 2.
- HANEBAUT, d', Cardinal, 3.
- Hastings, Edward, Lord, 283.
- Heath, Nicholas (Bishop of
Worcester), 240, 247.
- Heemskerck, Marten van
(painter), 357, 359, 360, 365,
366, 369, 370, 375 n. 2, 381,
382, 392-395, 399, 400,
402-405, 407, 408, 411, 423.
- Heerbrandt (protestant theo-
logian), 125.
- Henriquez, Henry, S. J. (mis-
sionary), 309, 310, 311.
- Henry, Infante of Portugal
(Grand-Inquisitor, brother
of John III.), Cardinal,
190, 191.
- Henry II. (King of France), 3,
20, 21, 33, 44, 54, 55, 58,
60, 77, 80, 83, 85-87, 92-
98, 101, 102, 106, 111, 124,
129, 131-140, 143-145, 148-

- 152, 203, 204, 231, 232, 260, 273, 438, 447.
 Henry VIII. (King of England), 238, 244, 282, 284, 287.
 Heredia, Baldassare de, O.P. (Archbishop of Cagliari), 105.
 Heusenstamm, Sebastian (Archbishop-Elector of Mayence), 104, 110, 113 n. 1, 114, 125.
 Hippolytus, St., 350.
 Hoffmann, Johann (envoy of Joachim II. of Brandenburg), 110.
 Hollanda, Francisco de, 397, 400.
 Honorius III., Pope, 408.
 Hooper, John (chaplain to Edward VI. of England), 241, 247.
 Horst, Gisbert (surgeon), 424 n. 1.
 Hosius, Stanislas (Bishop of Kulm and Ermland), 233-236.
 Hülsen, Christian, 358 n. 1, 360 n. 1.
 IGNATIUS OF LOYOLA, St., 178, 179, 182-186, 191-196, 199-203, 207-209, 223 n. 2, 226-231, 308, 310, 324, 325, 404, 418, 419, 426.
 Ignatius (Patriarch of Antioch), 313 n. 3.
 Imola, Pietro da (painter), 353.
 Inglesco, Giuseppe, 24 n. 5, 29 n. 3.
 Innocent VIII., Pope, 367 n. 4, 368-370, 420.
 Isenburg, Johann von (Archbishop-Elector of Trêves), 103, 104, 110, 113 n. 1, 114, 124.
 Ivan the Terrible, 236 n. 1.
 JACOMELLO, Jacopo, 105 n. 1.
 Japan, Emperor of, 315-318.
 Joachim II. (Elector of Brandenburg), 84, 109-111.
 John X., Pope, 411.
 John XII., Pope, 411.
 John III. (King of Portugal), 125 n. 2, 190, 208, 293, 295, 311, 312.
 Jovius, Paulus (*see* Giovio).
 Juana (Infanta of Spain, sister to Philip II.), 179, 209.
 Julius II., Pope, 11, 42, 46, 59, 110, 155, 363, 366-369, 371, 388, 389, 421, 453.
 Julius III., Pope (Giovanni Maria Ciocchi del Monte, Cardinal), 3 n. 2, 6, 17, 20-22, 25, 38-76, 77-98, 99-105, 110-124, 127, 129-157, 158-179, 180, 183, 186, 189-196, 210-237, 248-250, 253, 256, 257, 267-269, 273-279, 281, 282, 288, 307, 313, 314, 326-339, 357-367, 370, 375, 378 n. 1, 380-383, 387, 392-395, 402-406, 409, 415, 416, 419, 426.
 Kessel, Leonhard, S. J., 200.
 Knox, John, 246 n. 1.
 Koller, Wolfgang (agent of the Elector Maurice of Saxony), 115.
 LABARTHE, Paul de (Sieur de Termes, envoy of Henry II. of France), 95, 96, 101, 102, 151.
 Laetus, Pomponius (humanist), 396.
 Lafréry, Antoine (publisher), 358, 380.
 Lainez, James, S. J., 108, 182 n. 2, 186, 197, 199, 226.
 Laing, Count (Imperial envoy to Mary of England), 262.
 Landini, Silvestro, S. J. (Papal commissary), 193 195.
 Lang, Matthew (Prince-bishop of Salzburg), Cardinal, 7 n. 1.
 Lanssac (French envoy), 140, 141 n. 2, 152 n. 1.
 Lancilotti, Nicolas, 308 n. 3, 310, 311.
 Lara, Juan Manrique de (envoy of Charles V.), 281.
 Lasso, Diego (agent of Herdin and I.), 164, 172 n. 3.

- Latimer, Hugh (English reformer), 274.
- Lawrence (Japanese lay-brother, S. J.), 318.
- Le Jay, Claude, S. J., 200, 204.
- Lenoncourt, Robert de (Bishop of Châlons), Cardinal, 3 n. n, 6, 16.
- Leo IV., Pope, 388.
- Leo X., Pope, 4, 7, 47, 62, 213, 297, 356 n. 1, 366-369, 376, 377, 399, 401, 402, 407 n. 1, 409, 421, 425, 453.
- Leo XII., Pope, 343 n. 1.
- Letarouilly, 343 n. 1.
- Ligorio, Pirro (architect), 405 n. 1, 408 n. 1, 409.
- Lippi, Lippo (painter), 421.
- Lippo, Raphael Brandolino, *see* Brandolino.
- Lippomano, Luigi (Bishop of Verona, nuncio), 91, 99, 100, 103, 117 n. 4, 236.
- Lohninger, Mgr., 378 n. 3.
- Lorenzetto (painter), 400.
- Lorraine, John of, Cardinal, 6, 7, 20, 25, 30, 31.
- Lottini, Giov. Francesco (secretary to Card. Asc. Sforza), 37 n. 2.
- Louis, Infante of Portugal (brother to John III.), 190, 259.
- Luther, Martin, 108, 119, 239.
- MADRUZZO, Cristoforo (Bishop of Trent), Cardinal, 3 n. 2, 6, 10, 16, 23, 35, 41, 42, 52, 95 n. 1, 100, 101 n. 1, 105, 110, 127, 199 n. 7, 253 n. 3.
- Maffei, Family of the, 423.
- Maffei, Bernardino (secretary to Paul III.), Cardinal, 2 n. 1, 5 n. 1, 6, 10, 19, 21, 25, 41, 76 n. 2, 159, 163, 165, 167, 328, 389, 395.
- Maggio, Giorgio (Bolognese reporter), 43 n. 5, 154 n. 2.
- Magnus, Olaus (Archbishop of Upsala), 386.
- Malenotti, Bastiano, 337 n. 3.
- Malopera, Claudio, 173 n. 3.
- Mancini, Giulia (wife of Baldo-vino del Monte), 68.
- Manili, Lorenzo de' (Laurentius Manlius), 390.
- Manrique de Lara, *see* Lara.
- Mantua, Duchess of, 248.
- Marbach (protestant theologian), 125.
- Marcillat, Claude (painter), 421.
- Marcillat, William (painter), 421.
- Marillac (French envoy to the Imperial court), 84, 85.
- Mark, Marshall de la, 30 n. 3.
- Marliani, Bartolomeo, 405, 408 n. 1.
- Martin V., Pope, 412.
- Martin of Valencia (Franciscan missionary), 297.
- Martinellis (master of ceremonies), 415 n. 3.
- Martinengo, Girolamo (nuncio), 172 n. 3, 225 n. 1, 226 n. 4, 447.
- Martio, Alessandro (dramatist), 439.
- Mary (Queen of England, daughter of Henry VIII.), 237, 244-268, 270-281, 282-289.
- Mary (Queen of Hungary, daughter of Charles V.), 209.
- Mary Stuart, 260.
- Mary Tudor (sister to Henry VIII.), 244.
- Masius, Andreas, 51.
- Mason, John (envoy to Charles V.), 247, 283.
- Massarelli, Angelo (secretary to the Council of Trent), 2 n. 1, 26, 51, 62, 70, 74, 76, 99, 100, 106, 159, 167, 217.
- Massimi, Family of the, 373.
- Massimo, Pietro, 382.
- Matienzo, 303 n. 2.
- Mattei, Family of the, 388, 389, 392.
- Maturino (pupil of Raphael), 376, 377.
- Maurice of Saxony (Elector),

- 84, 114, 119, 122, 123, 126
128, 224.
Maximilian of Bohemia, 103 n.
1.
Mazzoni, Guilio (painter), 387.
Medici, Family of the, 423.
Medici, Bernardo de' (Marquis
of Marignano, brother of
Card. Giov. Angelo), 132,
146.
Medici, Catherine de' (Queen of
France), 4.
Medici, Cosimo I. de' (Duke of
Florence and Tuscany), 4,
18, 22, 33, 37 n. 3, 38, 44,
51 n. 1, 58, 67, 69, 141 n. 3,
144, 152, 153, 159, 170,
172, 336, 351.
Medici, Ferdinando de', Car-
dinal, 401.
Medici, Giovanni de' (son of
Cosimo I.), 172.
Medici, Giovanni Angelo de',
Cardinal (Archbishop of
Ragusa, later Pope Pius
IV.), 6, 41, 97 n. 4, 130 n.
3, 132, 158, 159, 163, 329,
381, 392, 411, 412 n. 4.
Medici, Guilio de', Cardinal, *see*
Clement VII.
Medici, Lucrezia de' (daughter
of Cosimo I., wife to Fabi-
ano del Monte), 69.
Medici, Luigi de' (son of Cosimo
I.), 172.
Melancthon, Philip, 118, 126.
Melchior (Bishop of Würzburg),
459.
Mendieta, Jeronimo de, O. S.F.,
298 n. 3, 299 n. 2, 301 n. 1,
303, 306.
Mendoza (Viceroy of Mexico),
302.
Mendoza, Diego Hurtado de
(Imperial envoy), 4, 5, 9,
11, 13 n. 5, 21, 29 n. 1, 33,
37 n. 2, 39, 78, 80, 85, 129,
130, 133 n. 3, 252.
Mendoza, Francisco de, Car-
dinal, 5, 41, 383.
Mendoza, Juan de (Imperial
envoy), 256.
Mentuato, Camillo (Bishop of
Satriano, nuncio to Poland)
234 n. 6.
Mercurio, Gianandrea (Arch-
bishop of Messina), Car-
dinal, 174.
Messichi (Armenian), 313 n. 3.
Meudon, Cardinal, 3 n. 2, 6, 17.
Michael Angelo, 56, 332-340,
352, 371, 382, 386, 394,
397, 410, 420, 421.
Michele da Viterbo, Fra Antonio
di, 368.
Mignanelli, Fabio (Bishop of
Lucera), Cardinal, 145, 146,
165 n. 1, 173.
Mocenigo, Alvise (Venetian am-
bassador in Rome), 367,
405.
Mochi, Prospero (Architect),
376.
Modesto, Francesco, 328.
Modio, G. B., 404 n. 3.
Modrzewski (secretary to the
King of Poland), 235.
Molina, Alonso, O. S. F., 305.
Monluc, Jean de, 97 n. 4.
Montague, Viscount, 284, 288.
Montalcino, G. Buzio da, 219
n. 1, 451.
Monte, del [Ciocchi del Monte
Sansovino], Family of the,
45.
Monte, del, Andrea, 216 n. 7.
Monte, del, Antonio (uncle to
Julius III., Archbishop of
Siponto), Cardinal, 42, 45,
46, 338, 352, 379.
Monte, del, Baldovino (brother
to Julius III., governor of
Spoleto), 46, 67, 73, 153,
338, 343 n. 1, 351, 402, 433.
Monte, del, Costanzo (brother
to Julius III.), 46.
Monte, del, Cristina (daughter
of Baldovino), 68 n. 2.
Monte, del, Cristoforo (nephew
to Julius III.), Cardinal, 86
173.
Monte, del, Ersilia [Cortese]
(wife of Giov. Battista),
163 n. 3, 328.
Monte, del, Fabiano (natural
son of Baldovino, married

- to Lucrezia de' Medici), 69, 331, 338 n. 2, 343 n. 1.
- Monte, del, Fabiano Ciocchi (advocate, grandfather to Julius III.), 45, 352.
- Monte, del, Giovan Battista (Regent of Fermo and Nepi, son of Baldovino), 68, 103 n. 1, 130, 132, 138, 328, 331.
- Monte, del, Giovan Maria Ciocchi, *see* Julius III.
- Monte, del, Giulia [Mancini], (wife of Baldovino), 68.
- Monte, del, Innocenzo (adopted son of Baldovino), Cardinal, 70-75, 163, 327 n. 4.
- Monte, del, Orsola (daughter of Baldovino), 68 n. 2.
- Monte, del, Pietro (governor of the Castle of St. Angelo, a kinsman of Julius III.), 66.
- Monte, del, Vincenzo (Consistorial-advocate, father of Julius III.), 46.
- Montelupo, Raffaello (sculptor), 352.
- Monterentio, Annibale, 216 n. 4, 436.
- Montfort, Hugo de (Imperial envoy), 103.
- Montufar, Alonso de (Archbishop of Mexico), 299.
- More, Antonio (court-painter to Charles V.), 353.
- More, Thomas, Sir, 249, 251.
- Morone, Giovanni (Bishop of Modena), Cardinal, 6, 10, 15, 16, 25, 31, 78, 88, 131, 159, 160, 168, 210, 223, 225, 226, 228, 229, 267-269, 274, 277, 278, 327, 328, 398, 452.
- Motolinia, *see* Benavente.
- Moulin, Charles du, 140, 232.
- Muzio, Girolamo, 326 n. 2.
- Muzzarelli, Girolamo (Archbishop of Conza, nuncio to Charles V.), 142 n. 1, 276, 278, 280, 283, 449.
- NACHIANI, I., (author), 331, n. 3.
- Nadal, Jeronimo, S. J., 182, 184, 186, 197-199, 201, 222, n. 3, 226.
- Nardini, Stefano (Cardinal), 380.
- Nausea, Frederick (Bishop of Vienna, envoy of Ferdinand I.), 104, 125 n. 2.
- Navagero, Bernardo (Venetian ambassador), 338 n. 2., 357 n. 1.
- Navarrete, Francisco (Bishop of Badajoz), 13 n. 1, 15 n. 1.
- Negri, Paolo Antonio, 212, 213, 441, 443.
- Neri, Philip, St., 57, 380, 418, 426.
- Nicholas V., Pope, 368, 396.
- Noailles, Antoine (French ambassador in London), 258, 261.
- Nobili, Lodovica de' [del Monte] (sister to Julius III., wife of Roberto de' Nobili), 46, 69.
- Nobili, Roberto de' (brother-in-law to Julius III.), 69.
- Nobili, Roberto de', Cardinal, (nephew to Julius III.), 69, 175-177, 328.
- Nobili, Vincenzo de', 132.
- Nobrega, Manoel da (Superior of the Jesuits in Brazil), 291-294, 296 n. 2.
- Norfolk, Thomas Howard, Duke of, 261, 263.
- Normanni, Family of the, 388.
- Northumberland, *see* Warwick.
- Noskowski, Andreas IV., (Bishop of Plozk), 236.
- Nuñez, Melchior, S. J., 307.
- ODESCALCHI, Paolo, 221 n. 1.
- Olave, S. J., 208.
- Oldecop, John (chronicler), 156.
- Olivo, Pirro (of Mantua), 50 n. 1, 52, 53 n. 2.
- Ormanetto, Niccolò (afterwards Bishop of Padua), 275, 278, 279.
- Orsi, Fausta, 213 n. 1.
- Orsini, Family of the, 383.
- Orsini, Camillo, 5, 53, 132, 144 n. 4, 147.

- Oviedo, Andreas, S. J., (co-adjutor bishop of Abyssinia), 313.
- PACHECO, Pedro (Bishop of Jaen), Cardinal, 3, 5, 13, 25, 32, 33, 41, 42, 79, 146, 164, 165, 221 n. 4.
- Paget, Lord, 261, 270, 283.
- Pagnani (conclavist to Card. Madruzzo), 35.
- Palestrina, Giov. Pierluigi da, 332, 419.
- Palladius, Blosius [Biagio Pallai], Poet (Bishop of Foligno), 74.
- Pallantieri, Alessandro, 63 n. 5.
- Pallavicini, Sforza, Marchese, 50 n. 3.
- Pantagato, Ottavio, 177 n. 1, 328.
- Panvinio, Onofrio (church historian), 48, 51.
- Papareschi, Family of the, 388.
- Parpaglia, Vincenzo (Benedictine abbot of Maguzzano), 248, 250, 251, 287.
- Pate, Richard (Bishop of Worcester), 284.
- Paul II., Pope, 369.
- Paul III., Pope, 1, 4, 5, 7 n. 1, 8, 9, 11, 13 n. 3, 41, 47, 48, 52, 56, 60 n. 3, 66, 73, 79, 83, 89, 170, 177, 181, 186, 189, 196, 215, 221, 233, 305, 313, 314, 333-335, 354, 356 n. 1, 357, 363-372, 375-378, 381, 382, 386, 387, 394-397, 399, 404, 407, 409, 413, 415, 416, 419, 425, 432-434, 453.
- Paul IV., Pope, *see* Carafa, Gian Pietro.
- Paul V., Pope, 343 n. 1, 373, 412.
- Pelargus, Ambrosius, O. P., 104.
- Pelletier, S. J., 222.
- Pendleton, 271 n. 1.
- Penning, Henry, 250, 253, 255, 258, 275.
- Pérac, Etienne du, 363 n. 2, 405.
- Percello, Petroleone, 440.
- Pereira (Portuguese envoy to China), 319.
- Peruzzi, Baldassarre (architect), 382, 391, 420.
- Petroni, Alessandro (physician), 404.
- Peter of Ghent, 299, 301.
- Peter, Martyr, *see* Vermigli.
- Phillip II., (King of Spain), 58, 103 n. 1, 169, 179, 189, 209, 259-268, 270, 277-289, 303, 353.
- Philips, Walter (Dean of Rochester), 274.
- Piccolomini, Costanza (Duchess of Amalfi), 401.
- Pichi, Family of the, 381, 384.
- Pierleone, Family of the, 391.
- Pighino, Sebast. (Archbishop of Siponto), Cardinal, 78, 80, 81, 83-85, 89-92, 99, 100, 113 n. 1, 117, 151, 165, 171, 173, 217 n. 2.
- Pinardi (engraver), 405 n. 2.
- Pinardo, Ugo, 374.
- Pinturicchio, Bernardino (painter), 421.
- Piombo, Sebastiano del (painter), 421.
- Pisani, Francesco, Cardinal, 6, 7, 160.
- Pius II., Pope, 367, 368, 370.
- Pius IV., Pope, *see* Medici, G. A. de'.
- Pius V., Pope, *see* Ghislieri.
- Pius VI., Pope, 343 n. 1.
- Pius IX., Pope, 343 n. 1.
- Planta, Thomas (Bishop of Coire), 217.
- Platina, Bartol (humanist), 396.
- Poggiano, Giulio, 177 n. 1, 328.
- Poggio, Giovanni Francesco (nuncio), Cardinal, 173, 189.
- Poitiers, Guillaume de (agent of Charles V.), 107.
- Polanco, Juan de, S. J., 176, 182 n. 2, 186, 191.
- Poland, King of, *see* Sigismund.
- Pole, Margaret (mother of Card. Pole), 244.
- Pole, Reginald, Cardinal, 6, 7 n. 1, 10, 12-19, 21-28, 30-33, 41, 48, 57, 70, 78,

- 88, 158-160, 199 n. 7, 210, 217, 222, 248-261, 267-269, 272-287, 327, 435.
- Pollajuolo, Antonio (sculptor), 421.
- Pollajuolo, Pietro (sculptor), 368, 421.
- Ponziani, Family of the, 388.
- Porcari, Family of the, 395.
- Porta, Guglielmo della, 394.
- Porto, Antonio do, O. S. F., 307.
- Poussin, Nicholas (artist), 412 n. 1.
- Pozzo, Jacopo del, *see* Puteo.
- Prat, Guillaume du, (Bishop of Clermont), 203, 204, 208.
- Prato Tedesco, Giov. di (goldsmith), 354 n. 1.
- Primaticcio, Francesco (artist), 352.
- Prospero, M. (painter), 48 n. 5.
- Pucci, Antonio, Cardinal, 364, 375.
- Puteo, Jacopo [Pozzo], Cardinal (Archbishop of Bari), 146, 151, 165, 173, 217 n. 2.
- Puy, de, Cardinal, 217 n. 2, 229.
- QUIÑONES, Cardinal, 398, 425.
- RABELAIS, François, 417.
- Rainerius, Ant. Franc., 330.
- Rangoni, Tommaso (physician), 142 n. 3.
- Raphael, 110, 364, 369, 371, 376, 400, 420, 421.
- Raverta [Rovere], Ottaviano, 221 n. 1.
- Rebiba, Cardinal, 221 n. 4.
- Renard, Simon (Imperial Envoy in England), 33 n. 1, 258, 260, 262, 265, 271 n. 1, 282, 283.
- Renée (Duchess of Ferrara, daughter of Louis XII. of France, wife of the Duke Ercole II. d'Este), 208, 218, 222.
- Rethius, Johannes (Burgomaster of Cologne), 200.
- Riario, Abbate, 132 n. 3.
- Riario, Cardinal, 381.
- Ribadeneira, Pedro de, S. J., 182, 209.
- Ricchi, Aug. (physician), 142 n. 3.
- Ricci da Montepulciano, Giovanni (Archbishop of Siponto), Cardinal, 88 n. 4, 134, 137 n. 5, 173, 350, 353 n. 1, 376, 433.
- Ridley, Nicholas (Anglican Bishop of London), 240, 241, 247, 274.
- Ridolfi, Niccolò (Bishop of Vicenza, Archbishop of Florence), Cardinal, 6, 7, 10, 20, 21, 25, 30, 31, 33, 37, 39.
- Rodriguez, Gonzalo, S. J., 313 n. 2.
- Rodriguez, Simon, S. J. (Provincial in Portugal), 191, 192, 291 n. 2, 310.
- Romano, Giulio (painter and architect), 375, 401.
- Romanus, Baptista, S. J., 198.
- Rosa of Siebenbürgen, 380.
- Roselli, Pietro (architect), 376 n. 4.
- Rosetto (abbot, papal envoy), 55, 139.
- Rossi, Lodovico de', 43 n. 5.
- Rot, M. (traveller) 365 n. 1, 374 n. 5.
- Rovere, Family of the, 402.
- Rovere, Domenico della, Cardinal, 364, 376.
- Rovere, Giulio della, Cardinal, 3 n. 2, 6, 37.
- Rovere, Guidobaldo della, (Duke of Urbino), 37, 58, 150, 152, 417.
- Roy, Thomas le [Regis], (prelate), 381.
- Rubeis, Giov. Hieron. (Bishop of Pavia, Governor of Rome) 154 n. 2.
- Ruggieri, Bonifazio (Envoy from Ferrara), 35 n. 1.
- Ruiz, Ferrante, 425, 426 n. 1.
- Rustici, Quinzio de' (nephew of Card. Andrea della Valle), 400.
- Rusutti, Filippo (architect), 412.
- Rutilonus, Sebastianus, 54 n. 1.

- SÀ, Men de, (Governor of Brazil), 296.
- Sabeo, Fausto (poet), 328.
- Sadoletto, Paolo (Bishop of Carpentras), 74, 327.
- Sahagún, Bernardino de, O.S.F., 300, 305.
- Salamanca, Antonio (publisher), 383.
- Salmeron, Alfonso, S. J., 108, 200, 222.
- Salviati, Giovanni (nephew to Leo X., Bishop of Fermo), Cardinal, 3 n. 2, 4, 6, 7, 10, 12, 16, 19-22, 25, 30, 31, 33, 37, 38, 40, 42, 170, 334, 364 n. 3, 389.
- Sanchez, Bautista, S. J., 187.
- Sander, Johann (Procurator of the Anima), 377.
- Sangallo, Antonio da (architect), 334, 372 n. 3, 373, 386.
- Sangallo, Francesco da, 344 n. 1.
- San Martino, Thomas de, (Bishop-Elect of La Plata), 290 n. 2.
- Sansovino, Andrea (sculptor), 420, 421.
- Sansovino, Jacopo (painter and architect), 45, 371, 375, 401, 420, 421.
- Santa Croce, Family of the, 390.
- Santa Croce, Prospero (nuncio), 140, 143, 152, 210, 232.
- Santa Fiora, the Cardinal of, *see* Sforza, Guido Ascanio.
- San Vitale, the Cardinal of, *see* Monte, Giovan Maria del, and Julius III.
- Saraceni, Giammichele (Archbishop of Matera), Cardinal, 173.
- Sardinha, Pedro Fernandez (Bishop of Bahia), 293.
- Sarpi, 72 n. 1.
- Sassi, Family of the, 382, 423.
- Sauli, Girolamo (Archbishop of Bari), 53.
- Savelli, Family of the, 361, 362, 391.
- Savelli, Jacopo, Cardinal, 6, 41, 147 n. 4.
- Savoy, Duke of, *see* Emanuel.
- Sbarra, Manno (artist), 354.
- Schauenberg, Adolf von (Archbishop-Elector of Cologne), 104, 110, 113 n. 1, 114.
- Schönberg, Nicholas von, Cardinal, 365.
- Scorel, Jan van, (painter), 357.
- Seguier, 205.
- Seripando, Girolamo (General of the Augustinian Hermits), Cardinal, 169 n. 7, 215.
- Sermoneta, Cardinal, 6, 41, 151.
- Serra, Albertus, 372 n. 3.
- Serristori, Averardo (agent of Cosimo de' Medici), 4, 22, 153, 160, 170, 171, 172, 175.
- Serristori, Bartol. (Archbishop of Trani), 142 n. 3, 449 n. 2.
- Sfondrato, Francesco (Bishop of Sarno, Archbishop of Amalfi), Cardinal, 6, 10, 12, 17, 25, 31, 33, 57, 78, 158, 210, 435, 457.
- Sforza, Guido Ascanio, of Santa Fiora (Bishop of Parma), Cardinal, 6, 10, 22, 33, 37-40, 328, 375, 379, 420.
- Sigismund Augustus II. (King of Poland), 79, 233-236.
- Siliceo, Juan (Archbishop of Toledo), Cardinal, 187 n. 7, 188, 189.
- Silvester II., Pope, 411.
- Silva, Miguel de (Bishop of Viseu), Cardinal, 6, 18, 23, 33, 41.
- Simoncelli, Girolamo, Cardinal, 175.
- Sipierre, Philippe de (agent of Henry II.), 94.
- Sirleto, Guglielmo (custodian of the Vatican Library), 328.
- Sisto da Siena (Minorite), 220.
- Sixtus IV., Pope, 1, 8, 369, 372, 374, 383, 386, 394, 402, 411, 420, 424.
- Sixtus V., Pope, 363 n. 2, 364, 370, 401, 412.
- Sleidan, Johann, 115.
- Soderini, Family of the, 402.
- Soderini, Cardinal, 364.

- Söll (Protestant theologian), 125.
- Somerset, Edward, Duke of (the Protector for Edward VI. of England), 237, 238, 239, 245.
- Soranzo (Venetian envoy), 246 n. 1.
- Soranzo, Vettore (Bishop of Bergamo), 217, 223.
- Spani, Prospero (sculptor), 345 n. 1.
- Spatafore, Hannibal (Basilian) 327 n. 6, 445.
- Stefaneschi, Family of the, 388.
- Stephen (Patriarch of Armenia), 313 n. 3.
- Stella, Tommaso, O. P., 416.
- Strada, J. (author), 331 n. 3.
- Straet, Jan van der (painter), 353.
- Strassen, Christoph von der (Envoy of Joachim II. of Brandenburg), 109, 110.
- Strozza, Ludovico, 53 n. 4.
- Strozzi, Piero (Commander in Siena), 151, 153.
- Stuart, Mary, *see* Mary Stuart.
- Suffolk, Charles Brandon, Duke of, 263, 265, 266.
- TAGLIAVIA, Pietro (Archbishop of Palermo), Cardinal, 171, 175.
- Tarano, Paulus de (commisary), 156 n. 3.
- Teodori, Giov. (heretic), 451 n. 2.
- Termes, the Lord of, *see* Labarthe.
- Teufel, Johannes [Angelo] (innkeeper), 384.
- Thirlby (Bishop of Ely), 240, 284, 288.
- Thomas, William, 266.
- Throckmorton, Michael, 250 n. 5.
- Titio, C., 173 n. 5.
- Titian (painter), 48 n. 5.
- Toledo, Eleanora de (Duchess of Tuscany), 196 n. 2, 208.
- Toledo, Francisco de (Envoy from Charles V.), 100, 114.
- Toledo, Garcia de (son of the Viceroy of Naples), 147.
- Toledo, Juan Alvarez de, Cardinal, 5, 10, 12, 17-19, 25, 27, 41, 43, 80 n. 3, 88, 141 n. 2, 147, 148, 151, 213, 216, 217, 228, 229, 379.
- Toledo, Pedro de (Viceroy of Naples, brother to the Cardinal), 10, 34, 55, 60 n. 4, 77, 78, 145-147, 208.
- Tolomei, Claudio (Sienese Envoy to France), 247 n. 2.
- Torquemada, Juan de, O. S. F. (historian), 306.
- Torquemada, Juan de, Cardinal, 415.
- Torre, Michele della (nuncio), 81, 85.
- Torres, Cosmo de (companion of St. Francis Xavier), 186, 192, 316.
- Tournon, F. de., Cardinal, 6, 7, 19, 25, 81, 86 n. 3, 88, 96, 106, 137-139.
- Tremellius, Eman. (Professor at Heidelberg, reformer), 242.
- Trivulzio, Antonio (nuncio), Cardinal, 81-83, 85, 102.
- Truchsess von Waldburg, Otto (Bishop of Augsburg), Cardinal, 3 n. 2, 6, 23, 25, 33, 41, 104 n. 2, 225, 227, 229, 256.
- Tunstall, C. (Bishop of Durham), 240, 246.
- Turci (prelate), 381.
- Tuscany, Duchess of, *see* Toledo.
- UCHANSKI, J. (Bishop of Chelm) 235 n. 2.
- Udine, Giovanni da (painter), 353, 376, 377.
- Urfé, Claude d' (French envoy in Rome), 8, 14, 16, 18, 19, 33, 34, 58, 86.
- Utissenich, George (Croat Paulist), Cardinal, 172 n. 3.
- VACA, Family of the, 376.
- Vaga, Perino del (painter), 371, 376.

- Valdes, Juan (humanist, secretary to Charles V.), 222.
 Valencia, Martin of, *see* Martin.
 Valentini, D. (physician), 142 n. 3.
 Valignani, Alexander, S. J., 321.
 Valla, Laur. (humanist), 329.
 Valle, Family of the, 365, 384, 399, 423.
 Valle, Andrea della, Cardinal, 399, 400.
 Vannini (Protestant theologian), 125.
 Vanuzzi, Francesco (almoner to Julius III.), 156 n. 3.
 Vargas, F. de (Imperial Secretary), 121 n. 1, 122.
 Vasari, G. (painter and historian), 48 n. 5, 334, 336, 340, 341, 352, 353, 370.
 Vega, Jo. de (Viceroy of Sicily), 87 n. 1.
 Velasco (Viceroy of Mexico), 302.
 Vendôme, Cardinal, 6, 19.
 Venice, The Doge of, 72 n. 2, 364 n. 4.
 Verallo, Girolamo (nuncio), Cardinal, 6, 10, 21, 88 n. 2, 135, 136, 146, 165, 217.
 Vergerio, Pietro Paolo (Bishop of Capo d'Istria, nuncio, apostate), 87 n. 3, 102, 219.
 Vermigli, Peter Martyr, 239, 242, 243.
 Vettori, Pier [P. Victorius], (Florentine Envoy), 58 n. 4.
 Vignola (architect), 335 n. 1, 335 n. 1, 340-342, 348, 351, 352.
 Villegaignon, Durand de (apostate), 296 n. 2.
 Vimercato, Francesco, 257, 270.
 Vimercato, G. A., 150 n. 1.
 Viola, S. J., (Superior of the Jesuits in Paris), 204.
 Vitale, Gian. (poet), 332 n. 4.
 Vitelli, Alessandro (Commander of the Papal Troops), 132.
 Vitellis, Paolo de, 94 n. 1.
 Volterra, Daniele da (painter), 353, 387.
 Voysey, John (Bishop of Exeter), 247.
 Warwick, John, Earl of (Duke of Northumberland, Protector of England), 237, 240, 244-246, 287.
 WELSER (banker), 371.
 Widmannstadt (Imperial Chancellor), 199.
 Wurtemberg, Duke of, *see* Christopher.
 Wyatt, Thomas, Sir, 263-266, 277, 287.
 YOSCHISCHIGE, Otomo (Daimio of Bungo, Japan), 318.
 Yoschitava, Ouchi (Daimio of Namaguchi, Japan), 317.
 ZEBRZYDOWSKI, Andreas (Bishop of Cracow), 236.
 Zorzi, Girolamo, 385.
 Zuccaro, Fed. (painter), 385 n. 2.
 Zuccaro, Taddeo (painter), 173 n. 3, 341, 342, 345, 352, 353.
 Zumarraga, Juan (Bishop of Mexico), 297-300, 303.
 Zwichem, Wyt van [Viglius], (Bishop of Ghent), 209.
 Zwingli, Ulrich, 239.

Pastor, Ludwig, Freiherr von
The history of the popes, from the
close of the Middle Ages.
v.13

BX
955
P35
1898

University of Toronto
Library

DO NOT
REMOVE
THE
CARD
FROM
THIS
POCKET

Acme Library Card Pocket
Under Pat. "Ref. Index File"
Made by LIBRARY BUREAU

